financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 2001 in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2, 3 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Madam, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned for lunch till 2.30 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at sixteen minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-four minutes past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI) in the Chair.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S RESOLUTION

Need to take Initiative to Unite Non-Aligned Movement Against War and for Global Peace

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Now, we take up the Private Members' Business (Resolutions). Dr. Dasari Narayana Rao, absent. Shri Jibon Roy to move a Resolution urging upon the Government to take the initiative to unite the Non-aligned Movement against the war and for global peace.

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I move the following Resolution :—

"Having regard to the fact that:—

1. the increasing trend amongst a section of the advanced countries

of using their military power to blackmail the economically weaker nations;

2. their superiority in weaponry, specially the atomic authority being used for increasing global exploitation, market expansion and establishing global control over scarce raw materials, particularly petroleum;

3. these countries are forcing the Government to surrender states' control over economy and even threatening of military interventions for furthering their design; and

4. Anglo-US threat of war against Iraq has endangered not only the sovereignty of a third world nation but has also put a question mark on the role of the United Nations, the world body founded after World War-II for upholding mutual respect and world peace; this House expresses its satisfaction that the people of India and its polity are by and large united on this issue, calls upon the people of India to consolidate themselves and join the worldwide opposition against the Anglo-US war threat to Iraq and urges upon the Government to take the initiative to unite the Non-Aligned Movement against the war and for global peace."

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it would have been better had it been a full-fledged discussion in this House, and some resolution passed. It could have been done through a *suo motu* statement or a discussion. Now things as they stand today, here are as if nothing is happening in the world. Sir, it is dangerous. I wish the discussion on the resolution should be over today itself and the hon. Minister should make a statement, and, if possible, adopted the Resolution even with amendments. An amendment is proposed by my hon. colleague, Shri Eduardo Faleiro, and is in the tune with the Resolution. I agree with that amendment too.

The war is almost declared in all its practical purpose. It is being told, day in and day out, by the people who profess themselves as the guardian of the contemporary civilisation, that they will go for a war, irrespective of any resolution adopted in the U.N. Security Council or the U.N. This is a blatant attack on the spirit of the formation of the U.N.O. as also the U.N. Charter. It is a dangerous thing. We should take this with all seriousness.

A team of Indian Parliamentarians, under the leadership of Shri Basudevacharya, of the other House, and some intellectuals, visited Iraq. Just yesterday night they have come back. According to them,

"people have reconciled to the fact that the war was coming, at any moment of time we would be bombarded by B2 bombers, next would be carpet bombing all over Baghdad and other areas." Three million soldiers are posted around Iraq along the borders of Kuwait and others. Saudi Arabia and Turky have not agreed to the U.S. base yet. And, the U.S. will bomb from all directions. If that happens, millions of people will die. My question is, what are we doing? Sometimes, I introspect as to what our political parties, our Parliament, our State, our Government are doing. The nearer the danger, the threat, more lukewarm is the response. It is dangerous. I question myself. It is, probably, a reflection of the decline of our civilisation. It should not have been taken. If it is a fact that the Indian people have reconciled with imperialism or if they have reconciled with global exploitation and military adventure like this, then it would have been a different thing. But to my mind, the Indian people by and large are against war, against imperialism and against exploitation. They are for humanity. Now it is not getting a vent. When millions of people in europe, even in UK, America, New York, Sydney, Australia are marching, we have not called upon the people to rise against this threat, an uncivilised act. Where comes the role of the Government? It is the duty of the Government to unite people against this. As you understand, Sir, it is not a matter of Iraq alone. It is a matter of the entire Third World nations. The moment the war starts, the price of petroleum will shoot up by 50 to 60 dollars per barrel. It has already gone up by 30 dollars per barrel. Our economy, the Third World countries, the people, all are involved in it, but it looks that there is no Government at all. Or, if the government is there, they do not know that something is happening in the world. The other day our Prime Minister was telling, "I feel that the NAM is still having its relevance." I do agree. But you go through the Declaration that came out in Kuala Lumpur. It is more an advice to Iraq than to the aggressor party. All of us are trembling. We do not have backbone. We do not stand up. Sir, if we go through the President's Address which was made before a Joint Session of Parliament and which we have passed, we find that not a single world was there about Iraq and about the war threat. Not a single world! All this reflects on our polity, on our politics, on our civilisation and on our vision. Now, Sir, thing is that a war will be there even if the UN Inspectors do not find a pencil cutter in Iraq. In that case also, a war will take place because it is for some other reasons. The Anglo-US forces, Anglo-US administration wants to remake the political

geography of Arab petroleum producing areas. And they will do it. The only mistake of Iraq is that they are having a petroleum reserve of about 1000 billion barrels. It is a proven reserve. They are having more petroleum which is not yet proven. And that is why that area has got to be captured. Another mistake is that it is not Iraq that all other big powers are having their companies in Iraq which are raising petroleum, but big companies in america and in England are not engaged in petroleum raising in Iraq. And the raising charges vest in Iraq than in any other part of the world. This is wrong with Iraq and that is why everyday they are being threatened that their country will be invaded. In fact, from the way the U.S. is moving to force the 'armament discipline' over Saddam Hussain's regime, it became clear that it is not for implementation of the U.N. resolution No. 1441. Now it is clear. Why they are doing it is also understood by the world nations and the world bodies. And, in such a situation, my submission before the government is that they have to take a lead to unite the third-world nations. And they should explain that the current attack or threat of attack is not against Iraq alone. It is a threat against all the weaker nations of the world—third-world nations. sometimes, we feel pleasure that the Cold War is over. but, I find, since the Cold War has gone, the hot war has come in. The Cold War engulfed the entire world. And, this hot war is against the third-world nations. With all fanfare, we have been beating the drum of globalisation. Now, the worldwide corporatisation has come in. Iraq war is a reflection of the corporatisation move. After some time, a day will come when they will corporatise even Oxygen! Sir, Oxygen would be marketed in the world! And we would be watching it helplessly. Hence, my submission is: Will the Government play its role? Will the Government take the leadership of the Non-Alignment Movement, which was founded and created under the leadership of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, under the leadership of India? will they unite the entire third-world nations against this attack? And, I urge upon the Government to come forward with a clear-cut statement on this question and take the initiative to unite the people in our country. By and large, the political parties, in our country, are against the U.S. war against Iraq. Representatives from all the political parties, cutting across their ideologies, have visited Baghdad—one team was led by the hon. Deputy Chairman, Dr. Najma Heptullah. And, in such a situation, the Government should take a sound position. Therefore, I request the House, all political parties and the Government to accept

this Resolution, if necessary, with amendments, and unite the people against this war threat.

I once again thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Now, there is one amendment by Shri Faleiro. Mr. Faleiro, you may now move your amendment at this stage without any speech. When your name is called, you can make your speech.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Goa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I move:

At the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"This House further urges upon the Government to promote greater political and economic co-operation in South-Asia so as to preclude foreign powers from exploiting the differences among our countries."

The questions were proposed

DR. M.N. DAS (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is most kind of you to have given me this opportunity to take part in this discussion. And, I feel doubly privileged that the hon. Minister of External Affairs is also present in the House. Sir, with your kind permission, let me give a brief background of international political system, which had evolved during the last 300 years.

During Eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when European powers dominated all over the world—the entire East and that whole Africa were their dominions, their colonies, their empires. At that time, in Europe, they maintained a system called 'balance of power'. 'Balance of power' means if Prussia wanted to become stronger, France, Austria and England would unite against Prussia. If France becomes powerful, other powerful nations would unite. so, somehow the world did not find any power as a Super-Power. That was how the 'balance of power' worked. But, when we come to early twentieth century, we find that the political system had taken a multi-polar character. Why multi-polar? Because, almost every power was a big power in europe. There was the British Empire, which made Great Britain a big power, a world power. There was French Empire; there was Dutch Empire; there was Belgium Empire; there was German Empire, and so on and so forth. So, it was multi-polar politics. And, that multi-polar politics took us to the First World War. After the First World War also the multi-polar politics continued till the Second World War. But,

during the Second World War, when America made nuclear weapons, the power was shifting to a country, which was supposed to be more powerful than other countries. The Second World War gave death blow to Nazism and Fascism. It also gave a deathblow to imperialism. Thus, ultimately, two Super-Powers emerged out of the Second World War. When the United States produced nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union also did not lag behind. Within years, they also manufactured atom bombs. So, there were two Super-Powers. The world politics became a bi-polar politics. Either this country, or, that country, or, all countries would lean towards the Soviet Pole or towards the US Pole. The world had been divided into two blocs—the Eastern bloc and the Western Bloc. Or, in a more refined way, they called them the Communist Bloc and the Democratic Bloc. What would happen to the merging new nations? After imperialism had died and the idea of Hitler to dominate the world had failed, and, in resurgent Asia, and Africa, all countries became independent, at that time, Sir, I draw the attention of the hon. Minister of External Affairs, though India became independent two years after the Second World War, and that whole world knew that India was a poor country—militarily poor, economically poor, it had no resources—yet India's first Prime Minister, who was also the Foreign Minister, through his moral power, and through his policy of world peace and human brotherhood, could influence the entire world and international politics.

For your information, Sir, even the two super-powers were afraid of India because India championed the cause of human brotherhood and universal peace. India became a champion of the freedom struggle in Africa and Asia. And, in the United Nations, India raised its voice against all forms of colonialism, imperialism, and racialism, etc. so, by our policy, we set a norm and a standard for India's superiority in the comity of nations. But, Sir, gradually, time passed and politics changed. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, there emerged only one super-power, the United States of America. If we study the diplomatic and political history of USA, after President Woodrow Wilson, we will find that to a certain point of time, American leadership believed in Americanism, to see USA become a prosperous country industrially, agriculturally and militarily. But they did not think of dominating the world.

But in recent times, what do we find? There is a type of hegemonistic attitude; namely, the only super-power must dominate the entire world.

The leadership in USA knows no scruples. What did they do in vietnam? What mischief did they play in newly independent Congo? They even went to the extent of eliminating Patrice Lumumba of Congo, and Go Diem of Vietnam. They had no scruples in politics.

Now, Sir, with this background I come to Iraq. Sir, the real villain in this present crisis is Great Britain, more than USA. Sir, Iraq is Mesopotamia, like, India is Bharat. It is one of the most ancient lands, a land of great civilization. And through centuries Iraq maintained its identity as a civilized country; powerful country. But, ultimately, a time came when the Sultan of Turkey who was the Caliph of the entire Islamic World and became the Emperor of the Ottoman Empire. And Iraq was a part of, or, a province of the Ottoman Empire. The Sultan of Turkey ruled Iraq. But, Arab nationalism was growing automatically. Turks are Turks; their religion may be same, but racially, Turks are different from the Arabs. So, the sultan ruled as Caliph of Khalifa; the word 'Khalifa' means, 'defender of the faith, the commander of the Faithful.' And the Khalifa was respected by the Muslims all over the world. But the Caliph made a mistake by jointing Germany's Kaiser william during the First World War. And when Germany was defeated; Turkey was also defeated. Now, taking advantage of the situation, the peacemakers after the First World War, decided to disintegrate Turkey. They declared the independence of Arab countries. Iraq and other countries became independent. But, they were not prepared for self-rule. So, Iraq was placed under the British Mandatory System. Great Britain would become the direct supervisor of Iraqi Government or governance.

3.00 p.m.

Sir, at this point of time, when we are talking of the Treaty of Sevres, 1921, and the Treaty of Laussane, 1923, one thing had come to the notice of the world powers and the people namely, what is the utility and value of oil? sir, only 25 years before the First World War, the first motor vehicle ran on the streets of America. soon it was realised that without petrol vehicles would not run. So, petrol became the main source of energy of power for vehicular traffic, all over the world. Great Britain knew that they would require petrol. And, the First World War showed that petrol was a must for any engine to run, and any plane to fly. Great Britain wanted to bring Iraq under its own domination to exploit oil resources. But Iraq did

not want it. They fought against the British administration. But, Great Britain being more diplomatic than any other country of the world, they placed on the throne of Baghdad, a puppet king, King Feizal. Behind this game their prime motive was to take as much oil as possible. They started dong that. But Iraqis revolted and became independent in the year 1932. Iraq began to grow agriculturally and industrially and in resources. Slowly, it became a great country. (*Time-bell*) But, taking advantage of the Second World War, in 1941, the British Army entered again into Iraq, and conquered Iraq. That was what they did. But ultimately, revolution took place in Iraq. King Feizal II was dethroned. Abdul Karim Kasem of Iraqi army took over power. Iraq became a republic. Kasem fell and Arif came. But, at that time, the Baath Party was taking shape.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Mr. Das, please conclude.

DR. M.N. DAS: Sir, one minute. Then, Revolutionary command council was formed, and Saddam Hussein came to power. During this critical time, America took oil from two countries, Iran and Saudi Arabia. The Shah of Iran was a puppet of American Government. The king of Saudi Arabia was and still continues to be a puppet of America. They were protected by the American military forces. America has reserves of oil for 50 years to come. But, after Irani revolution, when Ayottolla Khomeini came to power, Shah had to go out and die outside, America lost oil supply by Iran. Only Saudi Arabia was left. Now, US attention has been diverted to Iraq. They are thinking of how to control and capture Iraq, or, change the regime in Iraq? They are thinking on how to depose Saddam Hussein and establish somebody else! Oil is a must for America. After 50 years, she will have no oil. Then, how will the vehicular traffic flow? What will happen? Though they are trying to utilise solar energy or nuclear energy to run their vehicles yet that is a distant dream. That attempt is going on. Research is going on. That is a good thing. But anticipating that Iran will not supply oil, their target now is Iraq. In Kuwait war, America devastated Iraq very badly. Sir, it has been claculated that during the Gulf War more bombs were thrown on Iraq than the bombs thrown over entire Germany during the Second World War. So, Iraq was devastated completely. Baghdad was reduced to rubbles. All the industrial cities of Iraq were destroyed. Everything was destroyed. Now, again, they want to teach in lesson to Iraq only for oil. So, at this stage, at this critical

juncture of world politics, Sir, with due apology, I would humbly request our hon. Minister for External Affairs to kindly raise his voice with the same strength, with the same force and the same tune as Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru used to do. Even the Super-Powers were afraid of him. There may be only one Super-Power; does not matter. But India can raise the voice of humanity, voice of the Indian people.

So, I would conclude by suggesting that this excellent Resolution which has been brought forward by my esteemed friend, hon. Shri Jibon Roy, may be approved by this House. After all, the voice of Parliament is the voice of people, and, if, cutting across party-lines, the House supports this Resolution, it will show to the world community, world comity of nations that India stands for its principle of defending the weaker against the most powerful in the world. Thank you, Sir.

प्रो॰ रामबक्ष सिंह वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश): माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस माननीय सदन के बहुत ही सीनियर मेम्बर आदरणीय जीवन राय जी ने जो अपना संकल्प प्रस्तुत किया है, उस पर मैं अपनी बात रखने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस संकल्प को देखने के बाद लगता है कि इस संकल्प को सहज रूप से दो भागों में बांटा जा सकता है। एक तो इस संकल्प के माध्यम से उन्होंने आर्थिक पक्ष को रखा है कि किस तरह से विश्व के समृद्धशाली राष्ट्र, ताकतवर देश जो विकासशील राष्ट्र हैं, उनके आर्थिक हितों को नुकसान पहुंचा रहे हैं। दूसरी बात, जो उन्होंने कही है वह इराक के ऊपर अमेरिका के नेतृत्व में, उनके जो पिछलग्गू देश हैं, जैसे ब्रिटेन और आस्ट्रेलिया जैसे देश हैं, उनके द्वारा जो युद्ध का खतरा उत्पन्न हुआ है, वह इसका दूसरा पक्ष है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहां तक पहले पक्ष का प्रश्न है। मैं इससे पूरी तरह से सहमत हूं कि इस दुनिया के ताकतवर देश या विकसित राष्ट्रों ने पूरे विश्व के बाजारों पर नियंत्रण पैदा करने की कोशिश की है। डब्ल्यु॰टी॰ओ॰ के माध्यम से भी उन्होंने विश्व बाजार को हथियाने का प्रयत्न किया है। यही कारण है कि विश्व व्यापार संगठन की विकृतियों को दूर करने के लिए समय-समय पर इस सभा में हमारे विद्वान साथियों ने कई बार अपने सुझाव दिए हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि इसके लिए, इस दिशा में आगे बढ़ने के लिए अगर सबसे बड़ी कोई बाधा है तो हमारी ही अपनी ही बाधा है। हमारे अपने जो विकासशील राष्ट्र हैं, उनमें परस्पर एकता न होना, उनमें व्यापार के माध्यम से जितनी एकरूपता होनी चाहिए, समान विचारधारा होनी चाहिए, एक दूसरे के लिए अपने माल के लिए अपने बाजार खोलने के लिए जो काम होने चाहिए थे, वे काम ठीक से नहीं हो पाये हैं। एक कारण यह भी रहा है कि जब से दो ध्रुवीय विश्व एक ध्रुवीय विश्व में बदल गया तब से भी

विकासशील राष्ट्रों की आर्थिक स्थिति कमजोर हुई है। एक कारण यह भी है कि कुछ विकासशील राष्ट्र विकसित राष्ट्रों की कठपुतली बन गए हैं और इसके कारण से भी विकासशील राष्ट्रों का विश्व व्यापार में जो हिस्सा होना चाहिए, वह हिस्सा उन्हें प्राप्त नहीं हो सका है। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि विशेषकर भारत के संदर्भ में कहना चाहता हूं कि यह हमारा दुर्भाग्य है कि हमारा एक पड़ोसी राष्ट्र, चाहे उसकी आर्थिक हालत चरमरा गयी हो, जर्जर हो गयी हो, कमजोर हो गयी हो–गांव में एक कहावत है कि हमें अपनी एक आंख फोड़ लेना मंजूर है किन्तु पड़ोसी का आगे बढ़ना मंजूर नहीं है–आज वह पड़ोसी राष्ट्र इसी कहावत को चरितार्थ कर रहा है। यह भी समझ में आने वाली बात नहीं है कि अमेरिका जैसे विकसित राष्ट्र में अगर छोटी सी भी घटना हो जाती है तो वह दुनिया की परवाह नहीं करता है, संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की परवाह नहीं करता है और जिस राष्ट्र में चाहता है, उस राष्ट्र में मिसाइल का माध्यम से, अपने सैनिकों के माध्यम से उसे दंडित करने पर उतारू हो जाता है। लेकिन जो हमारे साथ हो रहा है और जिसे हम 20-25 वर्षों से भोग रहे हैं, जब हम उसी बात को कहते हैं तो हमें पाठ पढ़ाया जाता है। हमसे कहा जाता है कि धैर्य रखिए, बात करिए, आपस में बात करके कोई समाधान निकालिए। अमरिका के ये जो दो रूप हैं, ये समझ में नहीं आ रहे हैं मुझे लगता है कि इसी बात को समझ करके माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी ने एक दिन उस सदन में कहा भी था कि बहुत हो गया, हमने बहुत भरोसा किया है लेकिन अब हम अपनी तरह से अपनी रणनीति अपनाएंगे। यह बिल्कुल सही बात है कि जहां तक संभव हो, हमें युद्ध से बचना चाहिए लेकिन अपने राष्ट्र की सम्प्रभुता को दांव पर लगाकर किसी तरह के युद्ध से बचने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। इस संकल्प में यह बिल्कुल सही कहा है कि जो मुद्दे आदरणीय जीवन राय जी ने उठाए हैं, इसमें उन्होंने उल्लेख किया है कि इस राष्ट्र की जो जनता है और जो राजनैतिक दल हैं, वे कमोबेश एक हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि कमाबेश एक नहीं हैं बल्कि पूर्ण रूप से एक हैं। कहने का ढंग अलग हो सकता है, अपनी बात को रखने का ढंग अलग हो सकता है, लेकिन संपूर्ण राष्ट्र एक है। राष्ट्र का एक बच्चा भी नहीं चाहता है कि विश्व के किसी भी देश को दुनिया का दरोगा बनने का अधिकार दिया जाए। मान्यवर, जहां तक दूसरा प्रश्न है, दूसरा पक्ष है–इराक के विरुद्ध युद्ध की जहां तक बात है–इराक के बारे में जब यहां पर इसी सदन में चर्चा हुई थी, उस वक्त भी मैंने अपना पक्ष रखा था, अपनी बात कही थी। आज भी मैं उसी बात को दोहराना चाहता हूं। अमेरिका तर्क देता है कि चूंकि इराक में तानाशाही है, वहां लोकतंत्रशाही नहीं है इसलिए इराक का जो शासक है, उसे शासन करने का अधिकार नहीं है। मेरा विश्वास है कि इस तर्क में कोई सच्चाई नहीं है। अगर इस तर्क में सच्चाई होती तो फिर अमरिका ने तब पाकिस्तान का समर्थन क्यों किया था जब जनरल जिया ने वहां की सत्ता को हथिया लिया था? वहां उन्होंने समर्थन क्यों किया था? बात यह नहीं है। वास्तविकता कुछ और है। इसके पीछे मुझे एक कारण तो यह लगता है कि इराक का वह भूभाग जो तेल से समृद्ध है, उस तेल के समृद्ध हिस्से पर किस तरह से कब्जा किया जाए। जहां तक अफगानिस्तान का प्रश्न है, अफगानिस्तान के इशू पर संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ ने प्रस्ताव पारित किया और एक-आध राष्ट्र को छोड़

करके दुनिया ने उसका समर्थन किया। मैं समझता हूं कि यह बात इराक के परिप्रेक्ष्य में नहीं है। किन्तु जहां तक मैं समझता हूं, अफगानिस्तान में भी केवल इतना मामला नहीं था–मैं अपनी बात कहता हूं–कि केवल वहां की जो फासिस्ट शक्तियां थीं या वहां पर जो उग्रवाद था या वहां पर आम जनता की जो भागीदारी नहीं थी या वहां की जनता को आगे बढ़ने का मौका नहीं मिल रहा था, इसकी वजह से अमरिका ने अफगानिस्तान पर हमला किया बल्कि अफगानिस्तान के माध्यम से मध्य एशिया के जो राष्ट्र हैं जो खनिज सम्पदा से भरपूर हैं, उन पर प्रभाव कैसे स्थापित हो, वहां उनका मिलिट्री बेस कैसे बने, इस कारण से भी अफगानिस्तान पर हमला किया गया। अन्यथा यही अमरिका है जिसने उन शक्तियों को अफगानिस्तान में सत्ता सौंपी थी और जब उसके हितों के लिए खतरा पैदा हो गया तब अफगानिस्तान पर हमला किया गया। उन्हीं परिस्थितियों में भारत से कहा गया कि हमें अब पाकिस्तान के साथ झगड़ा करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। जम्मू-कश्मीर में विधानसभा पर हमला किया गया, यहां हमारी संसद पर हमला किया गया, हमारे मानदंडों को तोड़ने की कोशिश की गई और उसके बावजूद यह तर्क दिया गया कि अमरिका में उग्रवादियों के जो कैम्प हैं, उन पर हमला न किया जाए। अमरिका का यह तर्क समझ में आने वाला नहीं है।

मान्यवर, मुझे एक और बात लगती है। इराक पर अमरिका के वर्तमान राष्ट्रपति जूनियर बुश के पिताश्री ने हमला किया था। वे इराक में सद्दाम को सत्ता से सत्ताच्युत नहीं कर पाए। लगता है उनके मन में मलाल है कि हमारे पिताश्री जिस कार्य को नहीं कर पाए, हम इस कार्य को करके अपने पिताजी के जीते जी उनकी आत्मा को शांति पहुंचाएं। मैं समझता हूं कि शायद अमरिका के मन में यह भी है। लेकिन सारी दुनिया को सोचना चाहिए कि केवल एक आदमी की सनक के कारण क्या सारी दुनिया की आर्थिक स्थिति को बदहाली में फेंक देना चाहिए? आज तो केवल खतरा उत्पन्न हुआ है और खतरा उत्पन्न होने के बाद 18 डॉलर प्रति बैरल जो पेट्रोलियम, कच्चा तेल मिलता था, उसकी कीमत बढ़कर 35-36 तक हो गई है। जब युद्ध होगा तो क्या स्थिति होगी? विकासशील [illegible] स्थिति होगी? मुझे विश्वास है कि दुनिया इन सारी बातों को समय रहते समझेगी और [illegible] मैं समझता हूं कि प्रत्येक व्यक्ति चाहता है–हमारे देश का ही नहीं बल्कि [illegible] यही चाहता है कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की बिना अनुमति के अमरिका और [illegible] राष्ट्रों को इराक पर हमला नहीं करना चाहिए। इसका विश्वव्यापी विरोध हो रहा है। ब्रिटेन में साठ फीसदी जनता इस युद्ध के खिलाफ है। टोनी ब्लेयर अपनी लोकप्रियता की सबसे निचली सीढ़ी पर खड़े हुए हैं। यही नहीं, अमरिका में चालीस फीसदी जनता बुश के इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध कर रही है। ऑस्ट्रेलिया में भी विरोध हो रहा है और आज के इस परिप्रेक्ष्य में मैं समझता हूं कि एक बार फिर भारत को अपनी भूमिका का निर्वाह करना चाहिए। यह गुटनिरपेक्ष आंदोलन जो कमजोर हो गया है–मार्शल टीटो, कर्नल नासिर और हमारे लोकप्रिय प्रधानमंत्री पाननीय जवाहर लाल नेहरू के नेतृत्व में इस विश्व के अधिसंख्य राष्ट्रों का जो नेतृत्व किया जाता था, जिससे एक शक्ति बनी थी आज उस आंदोलन को पुनः शक्ति देने की आवश्यकता

है। जब यह होगा तभी मैं समझता हूं कि जो एक-ध्रुवीय विश्व है, वह बहु-ध्रुवीय होगा। जब ऐसा होगा तो मैं समझता हूं कि किसी भी राष्ट्र को पागलपन करने से पहले हज़ार बार सोचना पड़ेगा।

महोदय, मैं अंत में कहना चाहता हूं कि माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी हमारे बीच में बैठे हुए हैं। हमारी भावनाओं को उन्होंने समझा है, हमारे सहयोगियों की भावनाओं को समझा है, हमें विश्वास है कि इसका माकूल उत्तर दिया जाएगा और पूरा राष्ट्र मिलकर ऐसा प्रयत्न करेगा जिससे कि जो आशंका है, जो आशंकित युद्ध है, यह टले और पूरे विश्व में शांति स्थापित हो। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH (Rajasthan): Sir, I am glad that our colleague, Shri Jibon Roy, has made it possible for the Rajya Sabha to take up this grave matter, and I am very glad that the distinguished External Affairs Minister, Shri Yashwant Sinha, is present in the House, although I would have preferred that they would be in better attendance, when the House is discussing so profoundly important a matter, as the developments in West Asia in general, and Iraq, in particular. We have also taken note of the statement of the hon. Minister of External Affairs that India considers Iraq a friend. We have had good relations with Iraq, which is a Non-Aligned country, a secular country; which has helped India whenever there has been a crisis; which has spoken up for us in the OIC and in other fora also, when it come to Jammu & Kashmir being discussed in these international bodies. There has been broad consensus on our Foreign Policy. We had the Prime Minister responding to the President's Address. He also made a statement on the NAM summit, which he attended, and also circulated the Declaration adopted at NAM by the 13th Summit at Kuala Lumpur. The statement by the Prime Minister, of course, says that apart from the final communique in the Kuala Lumpur Declaration, the Summit also issued a statement on the Iraq and the Palestine issues. It was a significant achievement that the NAM arrived at a balanced consensus in the context of Iraq, with the unity of the Movement on the need for a continuation of multi-lateral efforts to find a peaceful solution to the Iraq crisis. There is also a clear exhortion to Iraq to fully comply with its obligations under the secruity Council Resolutions. Now, of course, nowhere in the final document, or in the particular document on Iraq, is the United States being mentioned. But it is implied throughout that the Declaration and the relevant paragraphs, I think 16 and 21, indirectly refer to the United States.

Now, Sir, we are confronted with a situation on which the Security Council of the United Nations is divided. Certainly, three if not four, permanent members—France, Russia and China—are not supportive of the intended military intervention by the United States and United Kingdom, and some ohter countries Spain and others to take military action. The United Kingdom has, of course, suggested a compromise, which I suppose, has done after consultation with the United States, that some more time may be given to the inspectors and Iraq be given a last chance. Now, the Security Council is meeting this evening. Mr. Blix and his colleaguge will be presenting their latest findings of their recent trip to Iraq. Iraq has started to disarm, and some of their missiles have been dismantled. But Mr. Bush, who is also to speak this evening, has already said that whether Iraq disarms or not, the principal objective of the United States is regime change. Now, this doctrine of regime change, of humanitarian intervention, to which the Kuala Lumpur Declaration draws our attention, is fraught with very grave dangers. First of all, it is unprecedented. Secondly, it bypasses the United Nations. It disregards world public opinion. Now, what happens if the attack on Iraq were to take place, not only for disarming Iraq, but to bring about a regime change? Bringing about regime change should be the responsibility of the people of the particular country. If this precedent is set that a hegemonistic single power—with whom we have good relations; obviously, it is in our interest to have good relations with the United States—were to decide, "Having done so in Iraq, what happens next? Who next and when next?", it will not be good. And here, I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of External affairs to this. President Clinton was here, when he was President, in 2000. He is the only American President on record, who, on Indian soil, said that Jammu and Kashmir is a disputed territory. President Eisenhower addressed the Joint Session of Parliament. I was there as a very young officer. He did not mention Kashmir as a disputed territory. Nor did Mr. Carter nor did Mr. Nixon, when they came to Idnia. But Mr Cilnton did it in this Central Hall of Parliament. And nobody from the Government objected! I raised a question, on behalf of the Congress Party, that the Prime Minister had a chance, at the Press Conference with Mr. Clinton in Hyderabad, to say, "Mr. President, you are our honoured guest. We have great respect for you. We like you very much, you are a very good communicator, but we do not share your views on Jammu and Kashmir, and I would be failing in my duty if I, as the Prime Minister of

India, did not say this to you publicly.", but this was not said. Now, he repeated the same thing on the 1st of March, in his broadcast on the "India Today" discussion that they organised. And he is on record, in May 1998, saying, "When Jammu and Kashmir is discussed, then China should be on the table." Suppose the United States, after their intervention in Iraq, decide to ask your Government and the Government of Pakistan to sit down and sort out Jammu and Kashmir issue as they want. Are you going to oppose it. I want a categorical answer from you on this, because the whole country would be interested to know what will we do if this hegemony continues, and they decide when is India next or Pakistan next or another country next, or South Korea next. Then, we are facing an unprecedented, horrendous situation to which the Security Council has no answer, to which the NAM has no answer, to which humankind has no answer. Is this a satisfactory external affair? So, I think the crucial issue is this. The United States, I think, has got some hurdles because Russia, China and France, Permanent Members, had Germany, a Member of Security Council, have taken a stand that they will not support the second resolution, which has been put forth by the United States. I don't think the United States would like to get the resolution vetoed. So, they may not even go to the Security Council; I do not know. You may have the latest information from our P.R. in New York. But if they go in, what are the consequences for India? I think, the Prime Minister made some mention of this, and he even said that if the need arose-and he hoped it would not arise—हमारे जो चालीस लाख लोग वहां रहते हैं उन्हें वापस लाने का इंतजाम किया जाएगा। Has the Government calculated the ramifications and dimensions of this influx into India of our four million people? And if this transfer of our people from the Gulf and Saudi Arabia, and the Region was to be for any length of time, it is going to produce results which will be mind-boggling. Even the economy of Kerala will collapse within a few weeks' time. There will be employment problems in several States, including my own, Rajasthan. These people are doing very well in the Gulf and Saudi Arabia. They are earning good money. They are sending remittances. They do not pay any tax. What will they do in this country? Who will take their place there? Have we calculated that Mr. Saddam Hussein is, let me say, a hero in the Islamic world? People may not say so openly, but the fact is that throughout the Islamic world, children who have been born in Muslim families are being named either "Saddam" or "Osama"! We may not agree with it, but this is a fact of life, and I am

sure, the Americans are also aware of it, but they do not care, which is, again, very alarming, because we have had pax Romana, we have had pax Britanica, and, now, we are having pax Americana! What the world needs is pax Planetica! And America can make that possible, because, if they have a good record in doing good to the world, they have an equally bad record in doing evil in the world. So, it is a great challenge for they are a democracy. And we are a democracy, and, I think, we should put forth our views. I am not saying that we pick up a quarrel with the United States. I think it is much better to do things at the diplomatic level. And I am glad that the President of America and the Prime Minister of India had a talk on this particular issue, on Iraq. But let us assume the worst scenario, that a minitary action takes place. What effect does it have on us? What effect does it have on our region; what effect does it have on our people, what effect does it have on the oil supplies to India and the prices of oil now is 40 dollars a barrel. If the conflict was to last longer and the hope that Mr. Saddam Hussein will agree to going to exile, or somebody will assassinate him, this is not going to happen. He is not going to run away. Nobody is going to assassinate him. If he has to go, he will go down, fighting, not on the knees, but standing on his feet. And, he will take a hell of a lot of countries with him. All the monarchies in the West Asian region will collapse. Only Saddam Hussein is holding them together. What Saddam Hussein also achieved is that it was for the first time in 57 years he has brought about a major breach in the Atlantic Alliance. It is not an insignificant event to see that the Americans are now going for the French and the Germans. I do not think that they will go too far with the Russians, although the Russians are in no position because of their economic situation to take on the USA, although Mr. Putin has said that he will exercise veto, if necessary, because they will not accept this kind of hegemonistic aggression against a country with whom they and we have friendly relations. I will simply conclude that on Foreign Policy, there is a broad national consensus and I think the House would like to hear from the distinguished External Affairs Minister who has, I may once again put on record, put the derailed non-aligned Indian train back on the right track, because for several years your distinguished colleague, who was sitting next to the Prime Minister, when the Prime Minister was speaking on Non-Aligned Movement, one could see the discomfiture and discomfort of your predecessor. You have brought the track back and I think in that I and the Congress Party have assisted you

NAM remains relevant, even though the President did not think if fit to mention the word 'NAM' in his Presidential Address in the 19 paragraphs that he devoted to foreign affairs and diplomacy. But be that as it may, I have already expressed to you privately my surprise at this that it was a major lapse, especially when the Prime Minister and you were going to Kuala Lumpur five days later. So, we would like to know—I know the limitations under which you function on an extremely delicate and sensitive issue, but it does affect hundreds and millions of people in this part of the world and certainly India—as to what concrete steps you have in your mind if the sinister doctrine of regime-change was to be extended beyond Iraq. It is unacceptable anywhere in the world. And, if once, they are going to get away with it, they will certainly try it again. I have already mentioned that we have to be extra cautions with regard to this humanitarian intervention or whatever name they have given it or regime-change of a part of the world. Thank you.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Resolution moved by my colleague, Hon. Jibon Roy, is regarding the situation prevailing in West Asia because of the intransigence confronted by several sectors. Sir, now the problem before us has developed in a different stage. There are two schools of thoughts. One thinks that this is one of the activities of reducing terrorism in the globe. The other school of thoughts, I can say who has majority in the world, they feel that this is one of the attempts of the developed countries to grab the oil market in their favour. When this is the fact, what is actually happening on this particular issue has to be considered in an unbiased manner. The recent development is, the United Nations' monitoring, verification and inspection Commission Chairman, Mr. Hans Blix, has observed that the step taken by Iraq to dismantle the missiles—they have already dismantled about 20 missiles called Al Samoud-2 series—along with the components and the fuel, is a significant step. They have not only dismantled the missiles and the components but also destroyed the design systems and casting chambers. When this is the fact, it has to be looked at from the angle of the decision taken by the Government of Iraq recently. We are told that these missiles are within the limit permitted by the United Nations' Security Council Resolution, that is, the weight of the payload and the guidance system has been within the limit permitted and approved by the UN Security Council. It is within the

permitted limit. In spite of that, the Government of Iraq had decided to dismantle them. Therefore, Mr. Hans Blix said, recently, that it was an important piece of real disarmament. When Mr. Hans Blix felt that it was a significant step, the United States of America clearly stated that it was insignificant. It used the word "Insignificant" in the sense that it was expecting a regime change also. When this issue was raised, Mr. Natwar Singh had raised a very important question. Who is next and when? It is an important question which he had raised. What we understand from the Press reports is that countries like Russia, France and Germany have demanded further inspection in a strengthened and expanded manner. It may take further four months. This was the request made by the other Members of the Security Council. In the mean time, there were interviews with the scientists who had invented their own models to manufacture the missiles. They were also interviewed. On the one side, disarmament is taking place and, on the other, interviews with scientists are taking place.

The third point is that, at the crucial stage, the Government of Iraq had called for a televised debate. When America was invited by Iraq for a televised debate. When America was invited by Iraq for a televised debate, America did not accept that invitation from Iraq More or less, the image of Washington, to some extent, is affected by its refusal to participate in the debate. When there is terrorism, we cannot go along with Iraq. We, cutting across the party lines, as far as external affairs policies are concerned, used to stand as one. That is our usual practice.

The Government of India's stand, as I understand, is that Iraq as well as other countries had to abide and stand by the decision taken by the United Nations Security Council. This is a very clear stand take by the Government of India. Mr. Hans Blix himself has accepted that an important change has taken place. Sir, recently the inspection team has excavated near Baghdad and found a significant quantity or ingredients used for the biological and chemical weapons had already been destroyed. That is also another positive step. Inspite of that, if they want a regime change, who has to change the regime of a nation, whether it is a developing, poor or developed country. We cannot do the same thing with the developed countires. They have agreed to assist the developing countries financially by 0.75 per cent of the GDP. We ask those developed countries, through this august House, whether they have complied with

the Resolution passed by the Committee consisting of themselves. No. Then, a peculiar situation is arising. We know that in Asia the real terrorism originates and develops, and it is still growing, in Pakistan. If at all, they have to eradicate terrorism, they must start fighting against Pakistan.

Therefore, Sir, I feel that if it goes on like this, it affects the market, particularly the oil market. Sir, in 1991, our domestic oil production was 70 per cent and we had imported 30 per cent from other countries. Now, of the total oil consumption, only 30 per cent is being actually produced in India; and we are actually importing 70 per cent from foreign countries. When the oil market gets affected, other markets are also affected. Therefore, the economy of the developing countries is also shattered little by little because of these conditions. Sir, now in Britain, the dissent has started appearing in the Labour Party itself.

Therefore, what we feel that they, whether it is America, Britain or whoever it may be, must comply with the Resolution passed in the United Nations and I hope the war will be avoided and the people of Iraq will enjoy their own rights. The sovereignty of the Iraqi people cannot be questioned by any other nation. Who has to rule the Iraqis has to be decided by the Iraqis themselves. With these words, I conclude. Thank you.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, sir, it will be a matter of great satisfaction for this country to see that on a fundamental question, this Parliament has a consensus, and, in fact, is united. The fundamental questions that the Resolution moved by Shri Jibon Roy raised—and I support them—are, one that there is a grand strategy of the rich countries of the world to control the global resources and specifically to control the resources of the third World. The second part is that it is in this context that the forthcoming attack and the situation in Iraq is to be seen. Iraq is merely an example of this grand strategy at work. To this I have added a third element, which is that, next will be us. Somebody mentioned here, "Who next?" The next, the State Department has already mentioned, are five countries, i.e. Iraq, Iran, Libya, India and Pakistan. These are the countries that have nuclear weapons and have weapons of mass destruction and are really a danger to global peace. The global peace is to be understood. It is the peace of the United States and the Western World. The peace of the United States and the Western World has also to

be understood. It means, maintaining the monopoly over the global resources, particularly the resources of the Third World. I have added to this a third element through my amendment. The third element is to the effect that if the Third World countries are to resist, to some extent, what should we do? We must be realistic, we cannot altogether avoid a substantial degree of domination over our economies and over our Region. But to avoid this to the maximum, what is essential is regional cooperation. Therefore, I have added this amendment that if we are to avoid the total effects of the global strategy led by the United States with the junior partner, the United Kingdom and some other allies in the West, if we have to avoid it to some extent, then the regional cooperation is of the essence. When did this grand strategy start? This has nothing to do with Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein was actually an ally of the United States, his was a client State. He was very good so long as he waged a war against Iran. It was after the war against Iran the resources of Iraq were depleted and Iraq became a client State. It was almost by inference—it appears now from the documents—with some sort of blessings of the United States and the Ambassador who was there at that point of time, that the attack on Kuwait had taken place. Now the problem with Saddam Hussein was not the weapons of mass destruction, was not the attack on Kuwait, the problem with Saddam Hussein was that he tried to be truely independent and not merely formally independent. What Saddam Hussein did in his country-I was there about two months ago-as policies of the Baath Party of which he was a leader, was not merely to depend on the oil resources, but also to develop agriculture so that he becomes self-reliant, also to control the oil resources, also to keep the Arab nationalism alive, to keep the Arab oil producing countries together, create even an Army to protect oil resources of the Arab countries. That is where he crossed the line. That is where he tried to be truely independent. What is expected from Colonies who become independent is that, well they may have their Government, they may have their Ministers, they may have their formal independence, but as far as the policies go, they cannot cross the line and cannot, over the last 50 years get any policy which affects the predominant position of the United States as a leader and its other Western allies. Of course, these policies were somewhat in abeyance during the Cold War whilst two super powers were in confrontation, it has now come out very aggressively. They were voiced first by Bush Senior after the war in Kuwait. That is what the New World

Order is all about and now more aggressively, implemented by Bush Junior. It was voiced, if I may mention here , as early as in 1948 and it was voiced by none other than George Kenan. George Kennan was a great statesman and analyst of the American policies who have great inputs to the American policies. In 1948 he was the Chairman of the Policy Planning Staff. In this top secret document of 24 February, 1948, which has not been declassified because 50 years have passed, known as 'Review of current trends: US foreign policy', this is what the Policy Planning Staff Review under the Chairmanship of a great man who was George Kennan had to say: He said: "We have about 50 per cent of the World's wealth"-he was talking about the United States-"but only 6.3 per cent of its population." Then, he said, "In this situation, we cannot fail to be the object of envy and resentment. Our real task in the coming period is to devise a pattern of relationships which will permit us to maintain this position of disparity without positive detriment to our national security. To do so,"- and the document countinues- "we will have to dispense with all sentimentality and day-dreaming; and our attention will have to be concentrated everywhere on our immediate national objectives including that of devising a pattern of relationships which will permit us to maintain the position of disparity between the west and the rest of the world"-they are the West and we are the Rest-"We need not deceive ourselves that we can afford the luxury of altruism and world-benefaction. We should cease to talk about vague and unreal objectives such as human rights, the raising of living standards and democratisation. The day is not far off when we will have to deal in straight power concepts. The less we are then hampered by idealistic slogans, the better." Therefore, President Saddam Hussein may disarm as much as he wants. He may remain with his pant and shirt, with no weapons, not even stones and sticks. Still, either he gets out and allows the Americans to put in a puppet regime, or, then, he gets killed and they take it by force. This is really what the policy is all about, and it concerns all of us. Therefore, when we have this type of a situation, what are we to do? We are to remember that it is not the Americans who did it for the first time. The British had done the same thing. What the Americans have done now is to take over Afghanistan. The taking over of Afghanistan was supposed to be meant to get hold of Osama in Laden. Nobody is bothered any more about Osama bin Laden. Nobody knows whether he is alive or not. it is most likely that he is alive; but nobody cares, because already a regime is in place in Afghanistan

which suits the United States of America. And, what is Afghanistan? Lord Curzon, who was the Viceroy of this country, had stated at that point of time, "Afghanistan is a piece in the chess-board on which the great game for world dominetion is being played." Now that Afghanistan has been taken care of it is the turn of Iraq. After Iraq, there will be imposed democracy "on other oil producing countries", and a day will come when, according to the State Department, the 'dangerous countries' like India and Pakistan will also have tc be taken care of! I would not blame here the United States? Who are we to blame them? It is the power game. It is the stronger trying to maintain that position of supremacy. How can we blame them? It is the same thing that happens internally. They use democracy to maintain power; we use religion. They are as democratic as any dictator, and we are as religious as any agnostic...

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF AGRO AND RURAL INDUSTRIES (SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM): Don't deviate from the point. You are speaking well.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I appreciate that. Therefore, please be relaxed, Mr. Minister; we may kill here as may people as we want; we may kill here the minorities; Pakistanis may send as many '*jehadis*' here; nobody is going to interfere. But if you cross the WTO, if you don't follow the policies which are imposed by the WTO, the IMF, the World Bank, then, you are in trouble. Then, all of us are in trouble. So, basically, what we have got here is this situation in which, we are now in a very clear and blatant manner, being told, "get back to your colonial position; have a Government if you must, but let us deal with your resources." And, that is why we have these policies of disinvestment, which must be implemented. Whatever in 50 years, during the Cold War, we could achieve in terms of self-reliance, that must be demolished. And, therefore, we must provide the markets here and we must provide the resources of this country because otherwise we are going to be in deep trouble. Now the way in which we can help ourselves to some extent is by regional co-operation. I have been saying this and I would like to reiterate here that it is in the interests of every one, in the interests of our own country, to have this regional co-operation. It is in the interests of India; it is in the interests of Pakistan and is in the interests of Bangladesh. All of us have a stake on this regional co-operation. All of us have a role to play. You cannot

clap with one hand. We have some things to do, so has Pakistan to do, so has Bangladesh and all the countries of this region. It is not only on one side. And the main thing that we must understand is that the policies that we are following are leading us to the same situation that prevailed in 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, which were the centuries of colonisation. How did the colonial powers come here? The colonial powers came here because the people of this country, the people of this region were fighting among themselves, were fighting on religion, were fighting on caste, were fighting on this basis. The people of this region, of this country were not together and that is how the colonial powers took advantage and came in here. Very often, we invited them ourselves and we must se that history does not repeat itself. It has been said that those who do not learn the lessons of history are condemned to see it repeated. And I say this, that is necessary to strengthen the SAARC because I heard during President's Address, a very important speech made here, and I particularly mention the very good speech made here by the Mover of that resolution. He would express what the Government would like to say but could not say. And the point made was, that SAARC in substance and in effect has become irrelevant. I would urge upon the Government to reconsider this and to strengthen SAARC. Recent deeds of the Government and words of the Government have not been helpful as far as strengthening SAARS is concerned, even as far as maintaining SAARC is concerned. Therefore, I ask the Government to reconsider its position. I understand, you cannot clap with one hand, you need both hands. All the countries of this region must, first and foremost , abjure and give up religious extremism and fundamentalism, which is the main cause of trouble in this region. Let us remain united and fight to the extent we can, for the benefit of our people against these forces, which are once again so aggressive coming at World domination and particularly the domination of the Third World countries including our own.

Thank you.

SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I share the anguish of one of the hon. Members who commented on such a poor attendance in the House, even though it is on Friday. But, actually, it is on American Friday that the United Nations will be meeting which will be our Saturday to listen to the second report of Mr. Hans Blix. I heard as many of the members must have done to the first report. And I was

greatly impressed by Mr. Hans Blix, he is a lawyer from Switzerland and he has presented a case within ten minutes and wrapped it up so effectively that I have never seen a presentation so magnificently done, as he did it. Without rancour, without bitterness and perhaps that should be the ideal that we have to now pursue when we are here almost on the brink. I hope for the best, Sir, but I fear for the worst. I am not very sure, what will happen next week or the week after. And we all have to keep our fingers crossed. I have just two points to make. The first is that we must never make the mistake of identifying a country with its President. We must identify a country with its people and not with its President. And as for the statement about heroes, there are no political heroes in the world. Mr. Suharto was a great hero, so was Mr. Gorbachev, although a democrat at heart, but they all fell by the way and therefore, our identity of the people of India which this Resolution stresses should be with the people of Iraq because whatever the regime, whatever they decide ultimately to do or not to do, we will have and continue to have the regard, respect and affection for the people of Iraq and not for a particular ruler, whosoever he may be. Sir, I cannot help expressing this sentiment because though I am totally opposed to the Buse-line as it is called, I cannot help but reflect that some of this bullying has paid dividends. And, we have had disclosure, upon disclosure, upon disclosure which Mr. Hans Blix himself admitted in a television interview, which, but for the threat of going to a unilateral war might never have been disclosed. Therefore, although there are 300 inspectors present on that side, and they are going all around, I have the feeling that a good deal is being attempted to be concealed by those in power in Iraq, whoever those powers may be. Therefore, my respectful suggestion to Mr. Jibon Roy would be that, though I entirely oppose any unilateral act of war, and support.

4.00 P.M.

What he says about NAM, we should remember that every member of NAM is also a member of the United Nations, and we must support, through NAM, the United nations, because if we do not, and if that structure breaks by some unilateral act of war-whether a veto is there or not—and ultimately we come to the position of one nation in the world virtually ruling or attempting to rule the world and the United Nations will have lost all sense of respectability. That is why I would support this Resolution.

So far as the first four paragraphs, the preliminary paragraphs, are concerned, I extend my full support. For the last paragraph, I spoke to my friend, Mr. Jibon Roy, and suggested if he would agree, and if the hon. Minister would also consider, the following can be inserted:

"That this House expresses its satisfaction that the people of India and its polity are, by the large, united on this issue, and expresses its solidarity with the people of Iraq and urges upon the Government to take the initiative to unite the Non-aligned Movement against any unilateral act of war, and for global peace.

In that way, I think we will be working not only with the objectives of NAM, but also with the wider objectives of the United Nations, of which we are a member, and the Universal Declaration in which we took a very major part in drafting in 1948.

Therefore, my respectful suggestion for the consideration of this House would be that we should all appear to be united-we should all be united-and I think that the Minister of External Affairs is sufficiently informed, well-informed, to appreciate what should be done in they very, very delicate situation that we are in today. Of course, we oppose any single country going to war without the United Nations, but at the same time, we cannot merely say that the United Nations cannot taken a decision with regard to whether or not particular weapons of mass destructions are there or are not there in any particular country. And Sir, with great respect, I want to say that I never support dictators, and I never will, and I do not like anybody supporting the nead of any country, howsoever great he may be the world opinion is that he is a dictator. Therefore, my respectful request would be that we should ally ourselves with the people of Iraq, and not with any particular Head of State, because that would be the correct way in which our foreign policy should proceed.

†मौलाना ओबैदुल्लाह खान आज़मी (मध्य प्रदेश): शुक्रिया वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, जनाब जीवन राय साहब के जरिए यह जो संकल्प आया है, मैं उसकी हिमायत में बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं। आपने मुझे इसकी इजाजत दी, उसके लिए एक बार फिर बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया। सर, अमेरिका इराक पर हमला करने की पूरी तैयारी कर चुका है। एक लाख पचास हजार की अमेरिकी फौज बमबार, हवाई जहाज और हथियारों से लैस खाड़ी में जाम हो चुकी है। अमेरिका को यकीन है कि तुर्की के 60 हजार फौजी उसकी पूरी मदद करेंगे। इराक के पड़ोसी मुमालिक सऊदी अरब, कुवैत,

†Transliteration of Urdu speech.

सीरिया, बहरीन और दुबई पर पूरा-पूरा दबाव अमेरिका की तरफ से डाला जा रहा है कि ये लोग इस जंग में अमेरिका की खुलकर मदद करें। सर, मुझे खुशी है कि पार्लियामेंट हाउस में हर पार्टी के सारे मैंबरान ने मुत्ताहेदा आवाज में इस अजीम संसद के माध्यम से अमेरिका की सख्तरीन मज्जमत और निन्दा का रास्ता अपनाया है। जुल्म फिर जुल्म है, बढ़ता है तो मिट जाता है। खून फिर खून है, गिरता है तो जम जाता है। अमेरिका की बुरी नीतियों पर-जिस तरह उसने हिन्दुस्तान के साथ-साथ पूरी दुनिया को अपमानित किया है इस पर खुलकर हमारे हाउस में चर्चा हो रही है । इराक के सिलसिले में अमेरिका का ताजातरीन बयान कि इराक के सदर सद्दाम हुसैन आतंकवादी हैं, उनका आतंकवाद से गहरा रिश्ता है, मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि दुनिया का सबसे बड़ा आतंकवादी खुद अमेरिका है और जब उसके आतंकवाद पर सारी दुनिया की नज़र पड़ गई है तो उसको छिपाने के लिए वह दुनिया के दूसरे मुल्कों को आतंकवादी कहकर अपने को बचाने की कोशिश कर रहा है।

सर, आतंकवाद क्या होता है? यकीनन आतंकवाद बहुत बुरी चीज है। इससे ज्यादा बुरी चीज़ दुनिया में पैदा नहीं हुई। कहीं भी आतंकवादी हमले होते हैं तो बच्चे यतीम हो जाते हैं, औरतों की मांग का सिंदूर मिट जाता है, मुल्क लहूलुहान हो जाता है, देश की इक़्तेसादी हालत चरमरा जाती है। इसलिए आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ना, आतंकवाद के खिलाफ जिहाद करना दुनिया की हर जहजीबयाफ्ता कौम का अकीदा है और होना भी चाहिए। मगर अमेरिका आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ने का जो पाठ हमें पढ़ा रहा है, अगर तारीख की रौशनी में जरा अमेरिका के कैरेक्टर पर भी नजर डाली जाए तो पता चल जाएगा कि सही मायनों में आतंकवादी कौन है? 1947 में हमारा मुल्क आजाद हुआ और 1948 में अमेरिका ने इजराइल जैसी एक नाजायज हुकूमत को क़ायम करते हुए फिलिस्तीनियों के हुकूक पर जबरदस्त आतंकवादी हमले किए। मैं यह बात इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि आजकल ब्रिटेन के वजीरे-आजम मिस्टर टोनी ब्लेयर जो इत्तिफाक से पूरी दुनिया में अमेरिका के वजीरे-खारजा कहलाए जाने लगे हैं, उनका बार-बार यह बयान कि हम आतंकवाद के खिलाफ जबरदस्त लड़ाई लड़ने के लिए हर कदम पर अमेरिका के साथ हैं और सारी दुनिया को वहं अमेरिका के साथ ले जाने के लिए कन्विन्स करने में कोई भी उपाय बाकी नहीं रख रहे हैं-उनको भी इस हाउस के माध्यम से हम आईना दिखना चाहते हैं कि आखिर आतंकवाद का मफहूम क्या तय हुआ है? किसी को बेजा आतंकित करने का नाम आतंकवाद है। फिलीस्तीन फिलिस्तीनियों का है उनके मुल्क पर नाजायज कब्जा अमेरिका ने करवाया-यह आतंकवादी हमला था। हिन्दुस्तान हिन्दुस्तानियों का है हमारे मुल्क पर इन्हीं टोनी ब्लेयर के पूर्वजों ने हमला किया, हिन्दुस्तान को गुलाम बनाया, गुलामी की जंजीरों में कसकर रखा गया, सौ साल तक हिन्दुस्तानियों का खून पानी से ज्यादा सस्ता किया गया। हमारे सारे स्वतंत्रता सेनानियों पर मुकदमात चलाकर ....(व्यवधान)... हां, सौ साल तक तो हुकूमत करके, बकिया दो सौ साल- यों तो मामला बहुत

पुराना है। बिजनेस के नाम पर , तिजारत के नाम पर, ईस्ट इंडिया कंपनी ने आकर जिस तरह हिन्दुस्तान को लूटा है, वह तो एक अलग कहानी है, बहुत दर्दनाक कहानी है मगर मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आतंकवाद के खिलाफ जरूर लड़ना चाहिए और आतंकवाद को जड़ से उखाड़कर फेंक देना चाहिए, यह तहजीबयाफ्ता कौमों का अकीदा है। मगर क्या हिन्दुस्तान पर ब्रिटेन के आतंकवादी हमले नहीं हुए? हिन्दुस्तान पर कब्जा नहीं किया गया? हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को तन के गोरे मन के काले लोगों ने काला-पानी की सजा नहीं दी? चन्द्रशेखर को क्या नहीं मारा गया? अशफाकउल्ला खान को क्या फांसी के फंदे पर नहीं लटकाया गया? क्या राम प्रसाद बिस्मिल को फांसी की सजा नहीं दी गई? हमारे सारे स्वतंत्रता-सेनानियों को आतंकवादी कहकर मारा गया, टेररिस्ट कहकर उन पर हमला किया गया और काला-पानी की सजा दी गई। ये वो ही मुमालिक आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ाई लड़ने की बात कर रहे हैं जिनका पूरा वजूद ही आतंकवाद के साथ लैस है और आज सारी दुनिया में वे खूंख्वारों के रूप में पहचाने जाते हैं।

सर, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम अपने मुल्क की आजादी के लिए जब जंग कर रहे थे तब हमें आतंकवादी कहा जा रहा था। क्या हम आतंकवादी थे? हमारी जमीनों पर दूसरों ने कब्जा किया, हम उस कब्जे के खिलाफ लड़ रहे थे, हमारा नाम स्वतंत्रता-सेनानी था, हमारा नाम मुजाहिदे-आजादी था, मगर जिन लोगों ने हम पर कब्जा किया था, जिन लोगों ने जुल्म और जब्र के जरिए हमारे मुल्क को हथियाया था, वे हमें स्वतंत्रता-सेनानी मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं थे, वे हमें मुजाहिदीने-आजादी मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं थे। उन्होंने आतंकवादी कहकर हमारे पूर्वजों की लाशों का ढेर हमारे सामने रख दिया। जलियावाला बाग लहूलुहान तौर से आज भी याद किया जाता है। इसी तरह से फिलिस्तीनियों की जमीन पर आज पचास साल से ज्यादा अर्सा गुजर चुका है। इजराइल के जरिए कब्जा करवाया गया। आज फिलिस्तीनी अपनी आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रहे हैं तो उल्टा चोर कोतवाल को डांट रहा है और अमरीका कहता है कि फिलिस्तीनी आतंकवादी हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि आतंकवादी हर वह शख्स है जो किसी को बेजा आतंकित करना है। इस सिलसिले में आतंकवादियों का अगर कोई सरदार पूरी दुनिया में है तो अमरीका के अलावा आज की दुनिया में कोई दूसरा नाम नहीं लिया जा सकता है। अमरीका ने किसको तंग नहीं किया? हिरोशिमा पर उसने बम बरसाया, नागासाकी पर बम बरसाया और चेचेनिया में उसने इंसानों को खून के आंसू रुलाए। फिलिस्तीन की जमीन पर उसने नाजायज कब्जा करवाया और जब उसने खुद यह कहा कि हम सारी दुनिया में आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ने के लिए खड़े हुए हैं तो उसका साथ देने वालों में जो लोग खड़े हुए, तब अमरीका ने बहुत फख्र के साथ कहा कि हमें गर्व है, हमें फख्र है कि आतंकवाद को मिटाने के लिए पाकिस्तान हमारे साथ खड़ा हुआ है। सर, एक डाकू डकैती को खत्म करने के लिए दूसरे डाकू का हाथ पकड़कर यह कहे कि दुनिया वालो, हम डकैती खत्म करने के लिए खड़े हुए हैं तो हमें होशियार हो जाना चाहिए, सावधान हो जाना चाहिए। हमारा कश्मीर लहुलूहान है। नफरत के शोले बरस रहे हैं। तअफ्फुन की फिजा में इंसानियत का दम घुट रहा है। डल झील में अब बर्फ नहीं सिर्फ खून है। सरकार ही बताए, यह कैसा जुनून है? हिन्दुस्तान की

आजादी पर प्रहार करने वाले, जन्नते बेनजीर कश्मीर को लहुलुहान करने वाले अमरीका के सहयोगी बने हुए हैं और जब कश्मीर का मसला आता है तो अमरीका, पाकिस्तान के आतंकवाद को देखने में अंधरा हो जाता है। वह हिन्दुस्तान से कहता है कि तुम शालीनता का सबक सीखो। तुम हमारी बात पर गौर करो और बातचीत के जरिए मसायल को तय करो। जबकि कश्मीर हमारा अटूट अंग है। इसका हल बातचीत के जरिए होना चाहिए। यह आदेश और फरमान अमरीका हमारे पर जारी करता है। अमरीका की बदनीयती सारी दुनिया के सामने आ चुकी है। वह अमरीका जो सारी दुनिया की दौलत पर... मैं ऐसा कोई जुमला तो नहीं कहना चाहूंगा जो गैर-पार्लियामानी हो, मगर उसने कुछ ऐसा तरीका ही अख्तियार कर रखा है कि सारी दुनिया की दौलत पर लालची, डैश डैश की तरह नजर रखता है। वह अमरीका सारी दुनिया की दौलत को हजम करने के लिए तैयार है और डकार तक लेने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। अरबों का कच्चा तेल पी जाने के लिए, हिन्दुस्तान जैसी सोने की चिड़िया को बरबाद करने के लिए, पाकिस्तान जैसे हमलावर मुल्क का सहयोग करते हुए पूरी दुनिया के अमनो-अमान को बरबाद कर रहा है। सर, मैं सिर्फ दो बातें और कहना चाहूंगा कि सद्दाम हुसैन को आतंकवादी कहने वाले मुझे यह बताएं कि तीन-तीन मर्तबा वह आदमी जम्हूरी एतबार से अपने मुल्क का प्रेसिडेंट बना है। आज उसको हटाने के लिए वन प्वाइन्ट प्रोग्राम चल रहा है कि हम सद्दाम हुसैन को उस मुल्क का प्रेसिडेंट नहीं रहने देंगे। जम्हूरियत का बहुत बड़ा अलम्बरदार बनता है, अमरीका। वह बहुत बड़ा दावा करता है, जम्हूरियत के सिलसिले में। मैं कहता हूं कि जनरल मुशर्रफ ने जिस वक्त पाकिस्तान को हथिया लिया, उस वक्त जनरल मुशर्रफ के खिलाफ लड़ाई लड़ने के लिए वह क्यों नहीं खड़ा हुआ? नतीजे में आज सारी दुनिया अमरीका के खिलाफ प्रदर्शन कर रही है। सारी दुनिया में अमरीका के खिलाफ, उसके जुल्म के खिलाफ वह सदाए एहतजाज बुलन्द हुई है कि तारीखे इंसानियत में ऐसी सदाए एहतजाज बुलन्द होते हमने नहीं देखी। सारी दुनिया पुकार रही है कि अगर दुनिया को इज्जत आबरू के साथ जिंदा रहना है तो अमरीकन नीतियों का घोर विरोध करना होगा। आज अमरीका के पास ताकत है। जिस ताकत की बुनियाद पर वह इंसानियत का नामो-निशान मिटा देना चाहता है, जिस ताकत की बुनियाद पर वह जुल्म की नई तारीख लिख देना चाहता है, मगर दुनिया में हिन्दुस्तान हमारा एक अजीमतरीन मुल्क रहा है कि जहां-जहां से जुल्म ने सर उठाया है, हिन्दुस्तानियों ने मनोबल के साथ उस जुल्म को कुचला है। आज जुल्म फिर अमरीका से सर उठा रहा है और साबित हो चुका है कि सारी दुनिया को अमरीका अपना गुलाम बनाकर रखना चाहता है। जिस युनाइटिड नेशन्स की हम बात कर रहे हैं, उस युनाइटिड नेशन्स में भी कितना दम है, वह हमें मालूम है। युनाइटिड नेशन्स को अमरीका ने अपने घर की लौंडी बनाकर रखा है और अपने घर की लौंडी की तरह अमरीका उसका इस्तेमाल कर रहा है। इसलिए मैं अपने मुल्क के अवाम को सलाम करता हूं। हमारी हुकूमतों ने अगर कोई कमजोरी भी दिखलाई है तो हुकूमतों की कमजोरी को खत्म करते हुए, हमारे मुल्क के अवाम ने, अपने मुल्क की हुकूमतों को खड़ा किया है। यहां वजीरे खारजा, जनाब यशवंत सिन्हा मौजूद हैं, मैं इनसे गुजारिश करूंगा कि इस जंग के जो बादल मंडरा रहे हैं, उन्हें छंटने के लिए हिन्दुस्तानी हुकूमत की तरफ से हिन्दुस्तानी अवाम की तरफ से भरपूर वकालत, इराक के लिए होनी चाहिए। अमरीका की खुलकर निंदा और मजम्मत होनी चाहिए ताकि इस जालिम के जुल्म से, सारी दुनिया के मजलूम इंसानों को निजात मिल सकें। बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया।

مولانا عبیداللہ خان اعظمی "مدھیہ پردیش" :

شکریہ وائس چیرمین صاحب ۔ جناب جیون راؤ صاحب کے ذریعہ یہ جو نوٹس آیا ہے میں اسکی حمایت میں بولنے کے لئے کھڑا ہوا ہوں، آپنے مجھے اسکی اجازت دی اسکے لئے ایک بار پھر بہت بہت شکریہ ۔

سر، امریکہ عراق پر حملہ کرنے کے لئے پوری تیاری کر چکا ہے ۔ ایک لاکھ پچاس ہزار امریکی فوج بمبار ہوائی جہاز اور ہتھیاروں سے لیس کھاڑی میں جمع ہو چکی ہے۔ امریکہ کو یقین ہے کہ ترکی کے ساٹھ ہزار فوجی اسکی پوری مدد کرینگے۔ عراق کے پڑوسی ممالک سعودی عرب، کویت، سیریا، بحرین اور دوبئی پر پورا پورا دباؤ امریکہ کی طرف سے ڈالا جا رہا ہے کہ یہ لوگ اس جنگ میں امریکہ کی کھل کر مدد کریں۔ سر مجھے خوشی ہے کہ پارلیمنٹ ہاؤس میں ہر پارٹی کے سارے ممبران نے متحدہ آواز میں اس عظیم سنسد کے توسط سے امریکہ کی سخت ترین مذمت اور نندا کا راستہ اپنایا ہے ۔ ظلم پھر ظلم ہے بڑھتا ہے تو مٹ جاتا ہے ۔ خون پھر خون ہے ٹپکتا ہے تو جم جاتا ہے۔

امریکہ کی بری نیت پر جس طرح اس نے ہندوستان کے ساتھ ساتھ پوری دنیا کو اپمانت کیا ہے اس پر کھل کر ہمارے اس ہاؤس میں چرچہ ہو رہی ہے، عراق کے سلسلہ میں امریکہ کا تازہ ترین بیان کہ عراق کے صدر صدام حسین آتنک وادی ہیں، ان کا آتنک واد سے گہرا رشتہ ہے۔ میں یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ دنیا کا سب سے بڑا آتنک وادی خود امریکہ ہے اور جب اس کے آتنک واد پر ساری دنیا کی نظر پڑ گئی ہے تو اس کو چھپانے کے لئے وہ دنیا کے دوسرے ملکوں کو آتنک وادی کہہ کر اپنے بچانے کی کوشش کر رہا ہے۔

سر، آتنک واد کیا ہوتا ہے یقیناً آتنک واد بہت بری چیز ہے ، اس سے بری چیز دنیا میں پیدا نہیں ہوئی۔ کہیں بھی آتنک وادی حملے ہوتے ہیں تو بچے یتیم ہو جاتے ہیں، عورتوں کی مانگ کا سندور مٹ جاتا ہے ، ملک لہولہان ہو جاتا ہے، دیش کی اقتصادی حالت چرمرا جاتی ہے ۔ اسلئے آتنک واد کے خلاف لڑنا، آتنک واد کے خلاف جہاد کرنا دنیا کی ہر تہذیب یافتہ قوم کا عقیدہ ہے اور ہونا بھی چاہئے۔ مگر امریکہ آتنک واد کے خلاف لڑنے کا جو پاٹھ ہمیں پڑھا رہا ہے اگر تاریخ کی روشنی میں امریکہ کے کردار پر بھی نظر ڈالی جائے تو پتہ چل جائے کہ صحیح معنوں میں آتنکوادی کون ہے ؟ ۱۹۴۷ میں ہمارا ملک آزاد ہوا اور ۱۹۴۸ میں امریکہ نے اسرائیل جیسی ایک ناجائز حکومت کو قائم کرتے ہوئے فلسطینیوں کے حقوق پر زبردست آتنک وادی حملے کئے ۔ میں یہ بات اسلئے کہہ رہا

ہوں کہ آجکل برطانیہ کے وزیراعظم مسٹر ٹونی بلیئر اتفاق سے پوری دنیا میں امریکہ کے وزیرخارجہ کہلائے جانے لگے ہیں، ان کا بار بار یہ بیان کہ ہم آتنک واد کے خلاف: بروست لڑائی لڑنے کے لئے ہر قدم پر امریکہ کے ساتھ ہیں اور ساری دنیا کو وہ امریکہ کے ساتھ لے جانے کے لئے کنونس کرنے میں کوئی بھی طریقہ کار باقی نہیں رکھ رہے ہیں ۔ ان کو بھی اس ہاؤس کے توسط سے ہم آئینہ دکھانا چاہتے ہیں کہ آخر آتنک واد کا مفہوم کیا طے ہوا ہے؟ کسی کو بے جا آتنکت کرنے کا نام کیا آتنک واد ہے۔ فلسطین فلسطینیوں کا ہے انکے ملک پر ناجائز قبضہ امریکیوں نے کروایا ، یہ آتنک وادی حملہ تھا۔ ہندوستان ہندوستانیوں کا ہے ہمارے ملک پر انہی ٹونی بلیئر کے پورودجوں نے حملہ کیا، ہندوستان کو غلام بنایا ، غلامی کی زنجیروں میں کس کر رکھا گیا ۔ سو سال تک ہندوستانیوں کا خون پانی سے زیادہ سستا کیا گیا۔ ہمارے سارے مجاہدین آزادی پر مقدمات چلا کر..... "مداخلت"..... سو سال تک حکومت کر کے بقیہ دو سو سال ..... یوں تو معاملہ بہت پرانا ہے ۔ بزنس کے نام پر تجارت کے نام پر ایسٹ انڈیا کمپنی نے آکر جس طرح ہندوستان کو لوٹا ہے وہ تو ایک الگ کہانی ہے، بہت دردناک کہانی ہے ۔ مگر میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ آتنک واد کے خلاف ضرور لڑنا چاہئے اور آتنک واد کو ضرور جڑ سے اکھاڑ پھینک دینا چاہئے ۔ یہ تہذیب یافتہ قوموں کا عقیدہ ہے ۔ مگر کیا ہندوستان پر آتنک وادی حملے نہیں ہوئے ؟ کیا ہندوستان پر قبضہ نہیں کیا گیا؟ کیا ہندوستان کے لوگوں کو تن کے گورے من کے کالے لوگوں نے کالے پانی کی سزا نہیں دی؟ چندر شیکھر کو کیا مارا نہیں گیا ؟ اشفاق اللہ خان کو کیا پھانسی کے پھندے پر نہیں لٹکایا گیا؟ کیا رام پرساد بسمل کو پھانسی کی سزا نہیں دی گئی؟ ہمارے سارے سوتنتر سینانیوں کو آتنک وادی کہہ کر مارا گیا۔ ٹیرورسٹ کہہ کر ان پر حملہ کیا گیا اور کالا پانی کی سزا دی گئی ۔ یہ ہیں وہ ممالک جو آتنک واد کے خلاف لڑنے کی بات کر رہے ہیں، جن کا پورا وجود ہی آتنک واد کے ساتھ لیس ہے اور آج ساری دنیا میں وہ خونخوار دہشت گرد (illegible) کے روپ میں پہچانے جاتے ہیں۔

سر ، میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہم اپنے ملک کی آزادی کے لئے جب جنگ کر رہے تھے تب ہمیں آتنک وادی کہا جا رہا تھا۔ تو کیا ہم آتنک وادی تھے؟ ہماری زمینوں پر دوسروں نے قبضہ ہم اس قبضہ کے خلاف لڑ رہے تھے ، ہمارا نام سوتنترتا سینانی تھا، ہمارا نام مجاہد آزادی تھا ۔ مگر جن لوگوں نے ہم پر قبضہ کیا تھا، جن لوگوں نے ظلم اور جبر کے ذریعہ ہمارے ملک کو ہتھیایا تھا وہ ہمیں سوتنترتا سینانی ماننے

کے لئے تیار نہیں تھے۔ انھوں نے آتنک وادی کہہ کر ہمارے پورووجوں کی لعشوں کا ڈھیر ہمارے سامنے رکھ دیا۔ جلیانہ والا باغ لہولہان کے طور پر آج بھی یاد کیا جاتا ہے۔ اسی طرح فلسطینیوں کی سرزمین پر آج پچاس سال سے زیادہ کا عرصہ گذر چکا ہے اس پر عزرائیل کے ذریعہ قبضہ کروایا گیا آج فلسطینی اپنی آزادی کی لڑائی لڑ رہے ہیں تو الٹا چور کوتوال کو ڈانٹ رہا ہے اور امریکہ کہتا ہے کہ فلسطینی آتنک وادی ہیں۔ میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ آتنک وادی ہر وہ شخص ہے جو کسی کو بے جا آتنکت کرتا ہے۔ اس سلسلے میں آتنک وادیوں کا اگر کوئی سردار پوری دنیا میں ہے تو امریکہ کے علاوہ آج کی دنیا میں کوئی دوسرا نام نہیں لیا جا سکتا ہے۔ امریکہ نے کس کو تنگ نہیں کیا؟ ہیروشیما پر اس نے بم برسایا۔ ناگاساکی پر اس نے بم برسایا اور ویتنام میں اس نے انسانوں کو خون کے آنسو رلائے۔ فلسطین کی زمین پر اس نے ناجائز قبضہ کروایا اور جب اس نے خود یہ کہا کہ ہم ساری دنیا کے خلاف آتنک واد لڑنے کے لئے کھڑے ہوئے ہیں تو اس کا ساتھ دینے والے لوگ کھڑے ہو گئے، تب امریکہ نے بہت فخر کے ساتھ کہا کہ ہمیں فخر ہے کہ آتنک واد کو مٹانے کے لئے پاکستان ہمارے ساتھ کھڑا ہوا ہے۔

سر، ایک ڈاکو ڈکیتی کو ختم کرنے کے لئے دوسرے ڈاکو کا ہاتھ پکڑ کر یہ کہے کہ دنیا والو ہم ڈکیتی ختم کرنے کے لئے کھڑے ہوئے ہیں تو ہمیں ہوشیار ہو جانا چاہئے، سادھان ہو جانا چاہئے۔ ہمارا کشمیر لہولہان ہے۔ نفرت کے شعلے برس رہے ہیں، تعفن کی فضا میں انسانیت کا دم گھٹ رہا ہے۔ ڈل جھیل میں اب برف نہیں صرف خون ہے۔ سرکار ہی بتائے یہ کیسا جنون ہے؟ ہندوستان کی آزادی پر پرہار کرنے والے، جنت بے نظیر کشمیر کو لہولہان کرنے والے امریکہ کے معاون بنے ہوئے ہیں اور جب کشمیر کا مسئلہ آتا ہے تو امریکہ پاکستان کے آتنک واد کو دیکھنے میں اندھا ہو جاتا ہے۔ یہ ہندوستان سے کہا جاتا ہے کہ تم شانتی کا سبق سیکھو۔ تم ہماری بات پر غور کرو اور بات چیت کے ذریعہ مسائل کو طے کرو۔ کشمیر ہمارا اٹوٹ انگ ہے، اس کا حل بات چیت کے ذریعہ ہونا چاہئے۔ یہ آدیش اور فرمان امریکہ ہمارے اوپر جاری کرتا ہے۔ امریکہ کی بدنیتی ساری دنیا کے سامنے آ چکی ہے۔ وہ امریکہ جو ساری دنیا کی دولت پر..... میں ایسا کوئی جملہ تو نہیں کہنا چاہوں گا جو غیر پارلیمانی ہو، مگر اس نے کچھ ایسا ہی طریقہ اختیار کر رکھا ہے کہ ساری دنیا کی دولت پر لالچی کتوں کی طرح نظر رکھتا ہے وہ امریکہ ساری دنیا کی دولت کو ہضم کرنے کے لئے تیار ہے اور ڈکار تک لینے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہے۔ عربوں کا کچا تیل پی جانے کے لئے،

ہندوستان جیسی سونے کی چڑیا کو برباد کرنے کے لئے ، پاکستان جیسے حملہ آور ملک کا سہیوگ کرتے ہوئے پوری دنیا کے امن وامان کو خطرہ پیدا کر رہا ہے۔ سر، میں صرف دو باتیں اور کہنا چاہوں گا کہ صدام حسین کو آتنک وادی کہنے والے مجھے یہ بتائیں کہ تین تین مرتبہ وہ آدمی جمہوری اعتبار سے اپنے ملک کا پریزیڈنٹ بنا ہے آج اس کو ہٹانے کے لئے ون پوائنٹ پروگرام چل رہا ہے کہ ہم صدام حسین کو اس ملک کا پریزیڈنٹ نہیں رہنے دیں گے ۔ جمہوریت کا بہت بڑا علمبردار بنتا ہے امریکہ ۔ وہ بہت بڑا دعویٰ کرتا ہے جمہوریت کے سلسلے میں۔ میں کہتا ہوں کہ جنرل پرویز مشرف نے جس وقت پاکستان کو ہتھیا لیا اس وقت جنرل مشرف کے خلاف لڑائی لڑنے کے لئے وہ کیوں نہیں کھڑا ہوا؟ نتیجہ میں آج ساری دنیا امریکہ کے خلاف پردرشن کر رہی ہے۔ ساری دنیا میں امریکہ کے خلاف، اس کے ظلم کے خلاف وہ صدائے احتجاج بلند ہوئی ہے کہ تاریخ انسانیت میں ایسی صدائے احتجاج بلند ہوتے ہوئے ہم نے نہیں دیکھی ۔ ساری دنیا پکار رہی ہے کہ اگر دنیا کو عزت و آبرو کے ساتھ زندہ رہنا ہے تو امریکی پالیسیوں کی زبردست مخالفت کرنی ہوگی۔ آج امریکہ کے پاس طاقت ہے ، جس طاقت کی بنیاد پر وہ انسانیت کا نام ونشان مٹا دینا چاہتا ہے ۔جس طاقت کی بنیاد پر وہ ظلم کی نئی تاریخ لکھ دینا چاہتا ہے ۔ مگر دنیا میں ہندوستان ایک عظیم ترین ملک رہا ہے کہ جہاں جہاں سے ظلم نے سر اٹھایا ہے ، ہندوستانیوں نے پرزور طاقت کے ساتھ اس ظلم کو کچلا ہے ۔ آج ظلم پھر امریکہ سے سر اٹھا رہا ہے اور ثابت ہو چکا ہے کہ ساری دنیا کو امریکہ اپنا غلام بنا کر رکھنا چاہتا ہے۔ جس یونائیٹیڈ نیشن کی ہم بات کر رہے ہیں اُس یونائیٹیڈ نیشن میں بھی کتنا دم ہے وہ ہمیں معلوم ہے۔ یونائیٹیڈ نیشنس کو امریکہ نے اپنی لونڈی بنا رکھا ہے اور اپنے گھر کی لونڈی کی طرح امریکہ اس کا استعمال کر رہا ہے۔ اسلئے میں [redacted] اپنے ملک کے عوام کو سلام کرتا ہوں۔ [redacted] ہماری حکومتوں نے کوئی کمزوری بھی دکھلائی ہے تو حکومتوں کی کمزوری کو ختم کرتے ہوئے [redacted] ہمارے ملک کے عوام نے اپنے ملک کی حکومتوں کو کھڑا کیا ہے ۔ یہاں وزیر جناب یشونت سنہا صاحب موجود ہیں میں ان سے گزارش کروں گا کہ اس جنگ کے جو بادل منڈرا رہے ہیں انھیں چھانٹنے کیلئے ہندوستانی حکومت کی طرف سے، ہندوستانی عوام کی طرف سے بھرپور وکالت عراق کے لئے ہونی چاہئے ۔ امریکہ کی کھل کر نندا اور مذمت ہونی چاہئے تاکہ اس ظالم کے ظلم سے ساری دنیا کے مظلوم انسانوں کو نجات مل سکے ۔ بہت بہت شکریہ ۔

" ختم شد "

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : श्रीमती सरोज दुबे। अनुपस्थित। श्री राजीव शुक्ल।

श्री राजीव शुक्ल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं दो मिनट में टू दि प्वाइंट कहकर अपनी बात खत्म करूंगा। पश्चिम एशिया की स्थिति बहुत चिंताजनक है। जीवन राय जी जो प्रस्ताव लाए हैं, निश्चित रूप से पूरे विश्व का ध्यान आकृष्ट करने के लिए आज इस पर चर्चा हो रही है। मैं बहुत सीधी-सीधी बात कहना चाहता हूं कि भारत सरकार का प्रयास यही होना चाहिए कि किसी तरह से युद्ध बचाया जाए। यह सिर्फ इराकी जनता का प्रश्न नहीं है। युद्ध से पूरा विश्व प्रभावित होने वाला है और भारत विशेष रूप से प्रभावित होगा। अभी कुछ ही दिन पहले मैं कुछ अर्थशास्त्रियों से बात कर रहा था, उनका कहना था कि मार्च के बाद स्टॉक मार्किट इम्प्रूव करेगा, बशर्ते कि इराक वार न हो जाए। इसका मतलब है कि अगर इराक में युद्ध हुआ तो भारत की अर्थव्यवस्था पर भी फर्क पड़ने वाला है, चाहे तेल की कीमत को लेकर हो या दूसरे तमाम तरीके से हो। विश्वभर इससे प्रभावित होगा। जान-माल का जो नुकसान होगा, वह तो अपनी जगह है ही। इराक की जनता इस खून-खराबे का शिकार होगी, वह तो होगा, वह तो होगा ही लेकिन इससे पूरे विश्व का भी नुकसान होने वाला है। इसलिए अंतिम दम तक भारत को यह प्रयास करना चाहिए कि किसी तरह से यह युद्ध टाला जाए। मैं यशवंत सिन्हा जी की इस मामले में बहुत प्रशंसा करना चाहूंगा कि वे लगातार अमेरिकी प्रशासन के संपर्क में बने हुए हैं और इधर भी जो लोग, इराक के साथ बातचीत करते हैं उनके भी संपर्क में हैं। किसी तरह से सिचुएशन को टालने का भारत प्रयास कर रहा है, यह एक अच्छी बात है। मान्यवर, मैं आपको एक दिलचस्प बात बताना चाहता हूं कि मुझे यह लगता है कि मुद्दों से ज्यादा जो व्यक्तिगत कुण्ठाएं, खुंदक या चिढ़ होती है उस पर आधारित युद्ध का वातावरण वहां बना हुआ है। मुझे यह सद्दाम हुसैन और सीनियर बुश, जो राष्ट्रपति बुश के पिताजी हैं, के बीच में पर्सनल एनिमिटी लगती हैं आज जो जरनल पॉवेल हैं वे उस जमाने में जनरल होते थे। उन्होंने इराक वार की पूरी लड़ाई लड़ी थी। क्योंकि दोनों के बीच में एक अजीब किस्म की निजी रंजिश की स्थिति बन गई है इसलिए यह उसी का नतीजा है। दोनों के बीच में हालात इतने खराब नहीं हैं कि इराक पर हमला कर दिया जाए लेकिन फिर भी माहौल बनता जा रहा है और एक प्रतिष्ठा का विषय बनाकर इराक पर हमले की कोशिश हो रही है। दूसरी तरफ सद्दाम हुसैन साहब हैं। आप इराक में जाइए, वहां अल रशीद होटल है। अकेला सरकारी होटल है। उसमें उन्होंने, खास तौर से जिस रास्ते से घुसते हैं, एक बहुत बड़ा जॉर्ज बुश, बड़े बुश का, सीनियर बुश का जमीन में चित्र बनवाया है। जो भी व्यक्ति घुसता है उनके चेहरे पर पांव रौंदते हुए जाता है। पहले वहां यह सिस्टम था कि आपको जॉर्ज बुश के मुंह पर थूकना पड़ेगा। वहां दो जमादार रहते थे वे लगातार थूक साफ करते थे तभी आदमी अंदर जाता था। जब इस तरह की खबरें उन्हें मिलती थीं तो निश्चित रूप से मिस्टर बुश को बहुत नाराजगी होती होगी। प्रेसीडेंट बुश के सत्ता में आने के बाद यह जो अचानक माहौल बना है, मुझे दोनों के बीच में यह एक व्यक्तिगत रंजिश ज्यादा लग रही है।

जहां तक आतंकवाद का बहाना लेकर इसे करने की बात की जा रही है तो मैं विरुम्भी साहब और ओबैदुल्लाह आज़मी से सहमत हूं कि पाकिस्तान से बड़ा आंतकवाद का कोई केंद्र नहीं है। पिछले दिनों सैम ब्राउनबैक यहाँ आए हुए थे मैंने उनके लिए लंच होस्ट किया था। मैंने उनसे यही पूछा था कि आप ही बताइए कि आपको अल-कायदा का एक भी आदमी इराक या लीबिया में क्यों नहीं मिलता है, ये सब पाकिस्तान में क्यों मौजूद हैं? इसका मतलब पाकिस्तान में उन्हें सुकून की जिंदगी मिलती होगी तभी वहां मौजूद हैं। अगर उन्हें पाकिस्तान में इतनी तकलीफ होती है कि वहां नहीं रह सकते तो पाकिस्तान में क्यों रह रहे होते। अगर यह कहें कि इराक आतंकवाद को बढ़ाता है, तो मैं इस मामले में कहूंगा कि सद्दाम हुसैन ने कभी टेरेरिज्म को प्रमोट नहीं किया। हां, उनको और इराक की जनता को, उन्होंने कहा कि वे जम्हूरियत से इलेक्ट हुए हैं, यह मैं मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूं। मेरा यह मानना है कि उन्होंने अपने आपको पूरा तंत्र बनाकर इराक देश पर कब्ज़ा किया हुआ है। अगर उनके ऊपर अमेरिका कुछ करता तो यह एक अलग बात थी लेकिन आज इराकी जनता का ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिए। पूरे विश्व में शांति बनाए रखने के लिए जरूरी है कि हर हालत में इस युद्ध को टाला जाए।

SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR (Punjab): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. I am, indeed, most grateful for the opportunity to speak on this very important subject and on the Resolution of my esteemed friend, Mr. Jibon Roy. I am, indeed, grateful to the hon. Minister of External Affairs who has found time to sit right through the debate, because, I do believe, irrespective of the number in the House the matter is of such grave importance that the hon. Minister must respond, after hearing every single hon. Member, who wishes to express himself on the subject. I will make a brief intervention and I wish to make three or four fundamental points.

We all know the context in which this Resolution is being debated. We all know that the threat of a wide-ranging war loom large on the horizon. As my esteemed friend, Shri Nariman said, 'we can hope for the best. But, we fear for the worst.' My personal hunch is that irrespective of a very wide and a broad consensus of public opinion against a unilateral war, I do believe, we are in for one. And, in that context, I would like to raise three or four fundamental questions. What is it that causes so much anguish to people across the world at the thought of this war? I think, the first and the foremost question is: Are we, today, in the 21st Century, succeeding or failing in outlawing a war which does not have the sanction of the U.N. and, which is *ex-facie* in violation of the first principles of the U.N. charter? Sir, I remember a quote which I read

many, many years ago and it has stayed with me. Mr. Vice-chairman, Sir, this is a quote of Louis Henkin, who wrote his magnificent book on "How Nations Behave." That is the title of the book. And, he said, in his opening remarks, "The history of civilization is a progress from force to diplomacy and from diplomacy to law." Today, we see a reversal to the first stage when a mighty nation could choose the timing of the war, the justification for the war and also the consequences of the war. India, whose influence in world affairs, we trace back to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, which basically, rested or was anchored in its moral authority, has to come forward to articulate the conscience of the nation, not to exert its force around armaments or around economic power, because in that line we are far below. But, I think, at a moral level, we have a voice which can hardly be ignored. And, Sir, you are armed with the collective will of this nation. You would have noticed that the people of India, speaking through their representatives, have spoken in one voice. You, as their Minister, at the moment, must emphasise that a war is seen to be morally unjustified. At a time, when four Members of the Security Council have cautioned against war, when the people of the world have expressed solidarity with the people of Iraq in the cause of peace, that is the time, Sir, for us, as a nation, to reassert our moral credentials and the moral force of our diplomacy and foreign policy.

The third question and the third submission that I have is on the question of the proportionate or the disproportionate use of force. We have seen, very recently, a whole nation-Afghanistan-razed to the ground by the mightiest power on earth today, in quest of one terrorist, Osama Bin Ladin. And, look at the tragedy, look at the anguish, look at the comic or a tragic laughter-call it what you may-that a whole nation is razed and one man is still not caught! Nobody even knows whether he is dead or alive. This only shows the limitations of war. It shows the limitation of the use of force. Sir, you are too knowledgeable a person for me to remind that the Second World War owed its origins to the humiliating peace inflicted on the vanquished through the Treaty of Versailles. I hope, Sir, that the so-called war to weed-out terrorism eventually should not, and I pray and I hope that it will not become, a reason for another global conflict. I must also, at the same time, caution against a strident attitude even against the US position because we

have been victims of terror. We know what terrorism can do to economies, what it can do to nations. We know that we are facing a real threat from cross-border terrorism. Therefore, if we can find a balance between a principled reservation against unilateral use of force and the imperative to strengthen a world conscience against terrorism, it would eventually ensure to the benefit of India. And, that, Sir, is going to be the test of your Foreign Policy. That is going to be the test of India's intervention at this very critical hour in the world. (*Time-bell*) I would only hasten to add, before I conclude, that we don't really have to be defensive when it comes to principles. I know, Sir, that it would be naive on anybody's part to say that we can afford to be compulsively, and by habit, on the wrong side of the United States. We cannot. We do recognise the merits. We do recognise the benefits and advantages of working together with the United States, insofar as our critical interests are concerned. But when it comes to a position of principle, when it comes to the assertion of moral authority, on which our Foreign Policy has been founded, starting from the time of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, India cannot dock; India cannot compromise; India cannot wait.

In conclusion, I would make a fervent appeal to you, to the Government of India, and personally to you. Please do take a leadership role in seeking to avoid the war; history will always recognise, then, the pre-eminent role which India has played. Thank you very much.

SHRI V.V. RAGHAVAN (Kerala): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. I congratulate my colleague, Shri Jibon Roy, for bringing this most burning issue before the world today for our consideration. I hope, this House of the matured parliamentarians can adopt this unanimously. I cut short my speech because we have to adopt it within time. The United States of America is not only challenging the world body of UN Security Council, but their war cry is also against the whole of humanity. The situation is getting worse day-by-day. Mr. Powell goes on declaring that the US will not wait for anybody's consent. It will act on its own. That clearly spells their aggressive arrogance. This attitude is not alone in regard to war against Iraq, but on all international issues, confronting the world today. For lack of time, I need not elaborate them. Iraq is fully cooperating with the UN Inspection Mission. Mr. Blix has gone on record that Iraq has destroyed, and is destroying the weapons which the UN Commission wanted to. In the Security Council,

mighty nations, like France, Germany, Russia and China are against this unilateral action of America. Not only that, a mighty mass upsurge is taking place in the world over, including the United States of America and England. Sir, about 20 lakhs of people participated in the historical march against war, in England. About five lakh people participated in the peace march in Washington. The people of America declare that this war is not for American people. It is for the oil and arms manufacturing companies. That is the truth. For the last 12 years, Iraqi people have been pushed to unimaginable sufferings. More than one million people died because of want of life-saving drugs. But, they upheld their self-respect and refused to surrender their birthright of deciding on who should rule their country. They did not want to surrender this birthright to the American ruling circle. Sir, our Prime Minister has recently stated that we will choose a middle path. I don't understand what he meant by this phrase. Sir, there is no middle path between war and peace. Sir, there is no middle path between the victim and the aggressor. India must, wholeheartedly, stand by the people of Iraq. Our voice should be firm against war.

Sir, we must stand by the emerging new world, which is against war and is for peace. This emerging world is not only against war, but it is also against the American attempt to dominate the world, both militarily and economically. Our hon. Minister knows well, through their various agencies, what the economic domination by the Americans mean. So, a new world is emerging against this economic domination. So, a new world, which is against war and is for peace, is emerging. Our stand must be with this emerging new world. That is the course we can adopt. It has been our course throughout history. So, in this critical stage we must stand up, and raise our voice. Our voice is a very powerul voice. Our voice should be against the American attempt's to wage a war on the whole of humanity. Thank you.

SHRI R.S. GAVAI (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, at the outset, I express my thanks to you for the opportunity you have given to me. I assure you that I will be very brief. At the same time, I express my gratitude and thanks to the hon. Member of this House, Shri Jibon Royji, who has moved a Resolution on a current and vital issue which is of paramount importance to all of us. I will start my speech with a

reference to the latter part of the Resolution of Shri Jibon Roy. It has a reference to the spirit of the latter part of the Resolution.

I will start by saying that the need of the hour is to follow the policy of the Non-Aligned Movement, started by late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. In fact, Shri Jibon Roy has made this appeal in his latter part of his Resolution. Sir, this policy relates to the logic and rationale to judge the right and wrong attitudes of the big powers of the world. Sir, this policy relates not to follow blindly either powers of the world, whatsoever the threat might be. Thirdly, because of this policy, late Shri Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru created the third power of non-alignment. That was a glamorous day when India led the Non-Aligned Movement, the third Group of the world. Late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was made its leader. Sir, the spirit of the Resolution of Shri Jibon Royji is about increasing the threats, particularly, from America. Using its military powers and weapons, it wants to blackmail the weaker nations. I think, this policy should be totally discouraged and condemned universally.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the present threat from America of a war against Iraq has endangered the very survival of humanity in the world. It has endangered the sovereignty of the Third Group of the world. So, it is the need of the hour that the people of the sovereign India should join the worldwide opposition to America. We should oppose its attitude against Iraq. Sir, right or wrong, it is not my personal opinion, it is the widespread opinion of the public that we are deviating from the policy of non-alignment, which was started by Shri Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. It may be right or wrong; it is the opinion of the general public that we are surrendering to America. As far as the real truth is concerned, the recent statement of the Prime Minister indicates their way, may be a middle way. As far as terrorism unleashed by Pakistan is concerned, a stern attitude has been taken in the NAM. Recently, he said to Mr. Bush that unless and until there is a concrete guarantee from Pakistan that it will not encourage terrorism, we will not negotiate with Pakistan. It reminds us of the spirit of Mr. Nehru who took the position that we were there to follow which was right and oppose what was wrong. It is a good thing. I, therefore, urge upon this Government to take the initiative to unite the Non-Aligned Movement, started by Shri Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru,

against the war, and for the global peace. I do congratulate Shri Jibon Roy, and appreciate my friend who moved the amendment, and also the spirit of the speech of Shri Fali S. Nariman in expressing solidarity with the people of Iraq. Thank you.

श्री खान गुफ़रान जाहिदी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जीवन राय जी ने जो संकल्प प्रस्तुत किया है, इस मसले पर हमारे बहुत अजीज साथियों ने अपनी राय दी है। मैं भी पूरी तरह से इस संकल्प के साथ हूं और साथ ही साथ कुछ बातें रखना चाहता हूं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हमको खासा होशियार होना है। मैंने अपनी पत्रकारिता के जमाने में जॉन फास्टेड डायलेस का एक पेज पढ़ा था। आज मुझे उस पेज की याद आती है कि उसने पॉलिसी मैटर में अपना बयान करते हुए यह कहा था कि जिस वक्त जिस मुल्क को चाहो तोड़ो। तो हमारे मुल्क के लिए उसने यह राय बनाई कि अगर हम किसी वाद का हिसाब करदें-क्षेत्रवाद लगादें, जातिवाद लगादें, सम्प्रदायवाद लगादें और किसी वाद को फैला दें तो उसके सामने यह मुल्क टुकड़े हो जाएगा। इस मुल्क पर जब कब्जा इम्पीरियिलिज्म ने किया, जब ब्रिटिश आए तो वह मर्चेंडाइस लेकर आया। अब इम्पीरियिलिज्म ने और जो कम्युनल फोर्सेज हैं उन्होंने रास्ते बदले। पहले ताजिर बनकर आया फिर कब्जा किया। उसके बाद मशीनें भेजीं कि हम बहुत डवलप्ड मुल्क हैं और हमने ज्यादा से ज्यादा बेहतर से बेहतर मशीनें भेजी हैं तो उन्होंने मशीनें भेजकर कब्जा करना शुरू किया। उसके बाद आज एक मनी पॉवर पैदा किया और पैसे के लिहाज से जब पैसा ताकतवर हुआ तो वहां पूंजी भेजो तथा इससे लोगों के जज्बात खरीदो, लोगों की राय खरीदो और उनको अपना गुलाम बनाओ। जिस तरह लीग ऑफ नेशन्स टूटा और यू॰ एन॰ओ॰ बना, उसके बाद भी इन फोर्सेज ने, जो वेस्टेड पॉवर्स थीं उन्होंने दूसरे तरक्की पसंद मुल्कों और गरीब मुल्कों की तरफ नए अंदाज से खेल खेलना शुरू किया। यू॰एन॰ओ॰ को सबसे ज्यादा पैसा अमेरिका देता है। जब वह इसको धमकी देता है कि नहीं, इसको हम तोड़ देंगे, खत्म कर देंगे तो सबके सब एक हो जाते हैं। तो उसके जरिए से क्या हम मआशी तौर पर उनकी पॉलिसीज के गुलाम होते नहीं जा रहे हैं? तरक्की पसंद मुल्कों में इस तरह पैसा फेंककर गुलामी नहीं लाई जा रही है और क्या सांस्कृतिक तौर पर भी वह हमारे ऊपर हमला नहीं कर रहे हैं? यह इम्पीरियलिज्म है-फॉर्म आफ इम्पीरियलिज्म। वियतनाम लेंग्युएज में वियतनाम के मायने बहादुर के हैं। फॉर्म आफ इम्पीरियलिज्म ऐसा जबदस्त था कि उस जमाने में जब वियतनामी लड़ रहे थे-उस जमाने में वियतनाम लफज इस्तेमाल नहीं होता था Vectom कहा जाता था। Vectom has done this. Vetcom के मायने हैं दहशतगर्द। तो अमेरिका किसी न किसी बहाने से, किसी न किसी मुल्क पर कब्जा करने के रुख में है और अपना स्टेंड बदलता जाता है। फौरन स्टेंड बदलता है। आज वह यू॰एन॰ओ॰ का इस्तेमाल कर रहा है जैसाकि अभी हमारे सीनियर साथी ने यू॰एन॰ओ॰ के इंसपेक्टर के बारे में कहा। अमेरिका ने कहा कि आपके मुल्क में कितने हथियार हैं, फलां क्या हैं। इसकी जांच के सवाल कैसे क्रिएट किए गए? क्या उसकी अपनी स्वायत्तता या

आजादी पर यह उसका हक नहीं आता। वहां इंस्पेक्टर भेजे जा रहे हैं। ऐसा क्यों? अगर भेजे भी गए थे तो फिर इंस्पेक्टर ने कितनी शानदार रिपोर्ट दी। उसके बाद भी कहा गया कि-नहीं, अभी तुम्हारे पास तबाह-कुन हैं। यानी तबाह-कुन हथियार खत्म करदो और खाली हो जाओ। ताकि आसानी से कुवैत में जो 50 हजार फौज पड़ी हुई है उसको चारों तरफ से फैला दिया जाए और उसके बाद वे दाखिल हो जाएं और मालूम हुआ कि वे सरेंडर हो गए, वे भाग गए या कत्ल कर दिए गए। चूंकि मिडिल ईस्ट एक ऐसा मुल्क है जो अपने को जम्हूरियत पसंद कहता है-डेमोक्रेट कहता है अमेरिका, जरा सी एक नजर डालिए कि जो बादशाह है उसका दोस्त, शेख है उसका दोस्त, जहां जरा भी रमक पैदा हुई जम्हूरियत की बस वहां पर खत्म कर दो। पाकिस्तान उसका दोस्त है। बदल दो हुकूमतें। तो कभी अय्यूब आ जाए, कभी फलां आ जाए, कभी फलां आ जाए। तो वहां डेमोक्रेसी का सवाल नहीं है। तो वह दोस्त हैं। मैं तो यह समझता हूं कि यह जो आतंकवाद का हमला उधर से हो रहा है, वहां से ये लोग भेजे जा रहे हैं तो अल कायदा सब उसका क्रिएटर है। अगर ऐसा क्रिएशन नहीं था तो अफगानिस्तान के बाद ओसामा बिन लादेन कहां है। फिर ओसामा बिन लादेन किसी और जगह से निकाल दिया जाएगा। They are the creator. वे एजीटेट करके, प्रवोक करके कर रहे हैं। हमें खुशी है कि हमारे मुल्क की जो एक फॉरेन पॉलिसी पहले बनी थी जिसका जिक्र जो हमारे पीछे बैठे हुए हैं, हमारे पूर्व फॉरेन मिनिस्टर और सामने वर्तमान बैठे हैं, तो पूर्व ने अपना जिक्र किया। उस पॉलिसी को कितना ढीला-ढाला करने के बाद नॉन-एलाइन, अब तो नॉन-एलाइन का सवाल ही नहीं है क्योंकि अब दो स्टेशन तो हैं नहीं। अब तो डेवलेपिंग स्टेज के डेवलपिंग मुमालिक का, तरक्कीपंसद मुल्कों का, विकासशील देशों का, एक संगठन बन जाना चाहिए। इसलिए कि यह आक्रमण सांस्कृतिक भी हो रहा है, यह आक्रमण आर्थिक भी हो रहा है, यह आक्रमण एक तरह से ज़िद पर हो रहा है। कभी कहते हैं कि हथियारों को खत्म कर दो। फिर कहते हैं कि हट जाओ, वह स्टेपडाउन हो जाए। यह किसको अधिकार मिला हुआ है कि एक जम्हूरी मुल्क मिडिल ईस्ट में बना हुआ है, उसके ताल्लुकात हैं, दुनिया के तमाम जम्हूरनवाज़ लोग, जो जम्हूरियत पसंद हैं, उन पर यह आक्रमण है। I am sorry मैं यह कहने का हक रखता हूं। मैं दो मिनट में अपनी बात कहूंगा कि The U.N.O. is on the verge of breaking. वह ब्रेक हो जायेगा, इसलिए कि जिस तरह से उसका इस्तेमाल हो रहा है। एक रिजोल्यूशन पसंद नहीं, दूसरा रिजोल्यूशन बनाओ और ऐसा रिजोल्यूशन बनाओ जो उनके हक में जाए और किसी तरह से उनको यह हक मिला जाए कि हम दखल दे दें, यह नहीं चलेगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे आपके मार्फत वर्तमान फॉरेन मिनिस्टर से कहना है, जिन्होंने इस मसले पर कुछ बातें कहीं हैं। लेकिन बड़ा नर्म रुख रखा है। सख्त बात कहने के लिए नर्म अल्फाज इस्तेमाल कीजिए। लेकिन ऐसा मैसेज जरूर जाना चाहिए कि सारा मुल्क एक है। सारे मुल्क के लोगों का मिजाज, हमारी नब्ज का उसको पता चल जाए, वह सारे मुल्कों की नब्ज पकड़कर

देखना चाहता है कि किसकी नब्ज कमजोर है तो उस पर कब्जा किया जाए। हमारी नब्ज इतनी मजबूत हो औरों की नब्ज के हिसाब से, उसकी आवाज के हिसाब से, एक ऐसी आवाज उठाई जाए, जो जम्हूरी मुल्क हैं, वे बच सकें। मुल्क का इतिहास बच सके और आतंकवाद का बहाना या फलां का बहाना, इस तरह के बहाने पर हमला करके कब्जा करने की जो उसकी नीयत बनी हुई है। एक नये इम्पीरियलिज्म, एक नया सिस्टम लाना चाहते है सारी दुनिया पर, उसके खिलाफ हमारा पुरजोर एहतजाज दर्ज होना चाहिए। इसीलिए हम पुरजोर हिमायत करते हैं इनके बयान की। आज इराक की पोजीशन यह है कि बच्चे के दूध के लिए तरस रहे हैं। क्या हुआ था 1957 में? इज़रायल, अमेरिका उस वक्त फ्रांस भी शामिल था, आज फ्रांस अलग है, इन तीनों ने हमला करके फलस्तीनियों को बाहर कर दिया। आज फलस्तीनियों को आतंकवादी कहा जाता है। वह अपनी ज़मीन पर रह नहीं सकते हैं। आज यह किस तरह का निज़ाम बनने जा रहा है! दुनिया के निज़ाम में बड़ी भारी तब्दीली आ रही है और हमको बड़ा होशियार होना है और इस बात का अहसास करना है कि हम आज जाग जाएं, ऐसा न हो कि सब सोते रहें। वह पाकिस्तान जो उनका दोस्त बना हुआ था उसके लोडर भी आज कह रहे हैं कि हम पर हमला हो सकता है। हां, बडे डाकू का साथ जब दो छोटे डाकू देंगे तो छोटे डाकू को भी मारा जायेगा। इसलिए वह डर, खौफ महसूस कर रहा है। हम जम्हूरियत में हैं और हमारे उसूल एक हैं। हम दुनिया के जम्हूरियत पसंद लोगों का साथ देने के लिए इराक का साथ दे रहे हैं, वहां के अवाम का साथ देंगे। ऐसे कुछ जज्बात से भरा हुआ आपका मैसेज़ भी हो, आपकी बात भी हो। इससे पहले पिछले दो-तीन साल में, हम देखते थे कि बड़ी नरमी आ रही है। वह नरमी आज काम नहीं करेगी। नॉन-एलाइन के बजाय डेवलपिंग और जैसा कि अमेंडमेंट दिया है हमारे साथी एडुआर्डो फेलेरियो साहब ने हमको अपने इलाके में छोटी-छोटी बातों को थोड़ा डायरेक्ट बात करके अपने मामलात को हल करना चाहिए और ऐसा मौका नहीं देना चाहिए कि बंदर बांट-बांट कर खायें और हम रो भी न पायें। इन हालात से बचने के लिए हम अपनी पालिसी में तरमीम करें, गौर करें, नज़रसानी करें और कोई ऐसा रास्ता अपनायें जिससे कि इराक को भी बचा सकें, वहां के जम्हूरी अवाम को बचा सकें और दुनिया के गरीब मुल्कों को बचा सकें और तरक्की पज़ीर मुल्कों का कोई इत्तिहाद खड़ा कर सकें, नये अंदाज में, नये तेवर में ताकि अमेरिका को अहसास हो जाए कि वह अब ऐसा नहीं कर सकता, धोखाधड़ी की टैक्टिक्स नहीं चलेगी। धन्यवाद।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to all the hon. Members who have taken part in this discussion which was based on the Resolution which, hon. Member, Shri Jibon Roy, has brought before this House. Before I come to the substantive part of the points raised, let me, once again, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, reiterate before this House that, fortunately, Foreign

Policy has not been a contentious or divisive issue in this country. In all these 55 years, the Foreign Policy of this country has always enjoyed a broad consensus. And, as I have said earlier on the floor of this House, it will be the effort of this Government to ensure that foreign policy remains outside the pale of immediate politics of this country, and that the secular trend, which has informed our foreign policy over the years, and the consensus, which has been built around the basic principles of our foreign policy, remains totally intact, and the real building bloc of our future discourse. Having said that, I would also like to point out that when I was listening very carefully to the debate in this House on this issue. I found that a consensus, indeed, has emerged from the various speeches, which have been made. There is a consensus even within this House on what should be our policy, *vis-a-vis*, the developing situation in Iraq, and I would go a step forward and say that, perhaps, between what has been stated here, and what is the stated policy of the Government, there is no difference, there is no divergence. It might be the case that some hon. Members will express it in a certain language; some others will express it in a certain language; some others will express it in certain other language. Even here, we notice the difference in the refinement of language. But, once again, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, though the situation is developing very fast now, as President Bush said in a speech which he gave at the press conference that he addressed a little while ago, that we are in the final stages of diplomacy, what will be the situation over the next few days, is something which I would not venture to predict in this House, at this point of time. Now, in this fast developing situation, at this point of time, if I were to once again reiterate the policy of the Government, what would I like to say.

The First point is that, we remain entirely committed to a peaceful resolution of this particular issue. India has always said from every platform, in every conversation, in every dialogue, publicly and privately, that we want a peaceful resolution; we want a diplomatic resolution, which means what? It means that we are against war; we are against a military conflict.

The second point is that the UN Resolution 1441 was a unanimous Resolution, it was even supported by a country like Syria, something which I pointed out when we had a debate on Iraq the last time. What

does it say? And it is salutary for us to take note of the Resolution. After many paragraphs, it says: "... decides that Iraq has been, and remains in material breach of its obligations under relevant Resolutions, including Resolution 687 of 1991, in particular through Iraq's failure to cooperate with the United Nations' inspectors and the IAEA, and complete the actions required under paragraphs 8 to 13 of Resolution 687 of 1991." That Iraq has been, and remains in material breach; a Resolution, which was unanimous; a Resolution which has been accepted by Iraq.

In the next paragraph, what does it say? It says: "A final opportunity to comply with its disarmament obligations under the relevant UN Resolutions." Suppose Iraq had not accepted this Resolution, or these Resolutions, then, we would be, perhaps, discussing here, whether we should be with Iraq; whether it should accept or not accept. But, Iraq has accepted all these Resolutions. It says, this is a final opportunity to comply with the disarmament order. And, naturally, warns that serious consequences will follow, if there is a further material breach. Now, therefore, compliance by Iraq of these resolutions, full and effective compliance, is something, which is inherent in the situaiton, and this is an obligation, which even Iraq does not deny. But whether there has been a further material breach or not on the part of Iraq is a determination, which the Security Council of the United Nations has to make. Therefore, what is the third principle? The first principle of our policy is, peaceful resolution. The second principle is, Iraq should comply. The third principle, therefore, flowing from this, is that whatever further decision has to be taken, should be taken multilaterally, through the United Nations Security Council. This is what we have said, and this means that we are against unilateral action. It means that we are against action, which is outside of the United Nations Security Council. I know that some statements have been made to the contrary, with or without the United Nations. But we have stated our position very, very clearly that it should be through the United Nations Security Council.

The fourth point, which we have, in consideration of the people of Iraq, upon which Shri Fali S. Nariman and ohers were speaking, that in view of the sufferings of the people of Iraq, in view of the plight to which they have been reduced, we have always said that once Iraq complies with these resolutions, and is not found to be in further material breach, then the sanctions, which have been imposed on Iraq, should be lifted.

This is the position, which India has always advocated.

5.00 P.M.

Now, we have out own reasons. A point has been made here of the impact on the global economy, on the Indian economy, that impact is being felt by us even today, despite the fact that the war has not actually broken out. But if the petroleum crude prices have gone up to something like $40, then it has an impact on our economy, it has an impact on the world economy; and the slow-down of the world economy has an impact on the Indian economy, so, that, plus the fact that we have a large number of Indians residing in that area, needs to be pondered over. But let me also assure the House that I do not think the Prime Minister's intention was that we will have to bring back all the four million people, or 3.5 million people, who live in that area. I think the situation in 1991 was very different than the situation, which is likely to emerge, and we have always said that there is no reason for the Indians resident in that area to panic. And that is something, which I would like to repeat today. I had, Sir, taken a meeting of the Indian Ambassadors in that area—all the Ambassadors, who are in those nine-ten countries—last month, personally reviewed the situation with each one of them, personally made inquiries as to what is likely to happen to the Indian population, and I do not think we have, on our hands, a situation, which will require a massive air-lift of people. There might be some slight dislocation. But we will be able to take care of that, and I would like to assure the House that whatever precautions have to be taken by the Government of India, whatever preparation has to be made by the Government of India, we have made, in order to ensure that our citizens in those countries are not put to any particular hardship. So, the policy of India, Mr. Vice-Chairman, has been based on certain principles. And these are the four, five principles that I have put before you. I find from the discussion in this House that those are basically the points, which have been made in the debate in this House also. Now, it is true, I agree entirely with the hon. Member, Dr. M.N. Das when he said that we are at a critical juncture in world history. Because, there are many kinds of challenges, there are many questions, which will arise as a result of the action, which is likely to take place.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): यदि सदन की अनुमति हो तो सदन का समय कुछ और बढ़ा लें?

कुछ माननीय सदस्य: जी हां।

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Thank you, Sir.

Sir, we are at a critical juncture because the whole issue has raised so many questions which will have to be answered by the combined wisdom of the international community. It is not just a question of one nation and how it behaves. The entire international community will have to get together and exercise its wisdom to answer some of these issues which are already being thrown up. But I will also entirely agree with Mr. Natwar Singh when he says that we are facing a very delicate and sensitive issue here, and I have no hesitation in saying, Sir, that we have worked hard to improve our relationship with the U.S. In the last few years, this relationship has been transformed, we have much more understanding, and it is as it should be, because between the largest, as they say, and the most powerful democracy on earth, there is no reasons why we should always be quarrelling amongst ourselves, and, therefore, in our relationship, we have started emphasising the commonalities which exist. There are many issues where we are prepared to see eye to eye, and it has promoted an understanding, it has promoted an intensification of our relationship, and we are interested in maintaining that relationship, but without sacrificing our national interest, without sacrificing our principles, because India's foreign policy, as has been said here, has been marked by a set of principles which have guided the Non-Aligned Movement. Sir, the Non-Aligned Movement is something for which I could take some reasonable amount of credit. Some of the Members, here, are aware that when the second brain-storming meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement took place in December, last year, in Cape Town, I decided to attend on behalf of India, and I found I was the only third Foreign Minister who was attending that meeting, apart from the South African Foreign Minister—who had to be there because she was the host—and the Malaysian Foreign Minister—who had to be there because Malaysia was going to take over the Chairmanship of the Summit which had recently been concluded. Apart from these two, India was the only country which was represented at the Ministerial level, and we made our contribution. I am glad to say that, as a result of the contribution that we made with regard to the relevance of NAM, which was the theme of NAM Summit in Malaysia in February, all the

suggestions that we had made, were accepted. And it was not that we went either to the Summit or to the brain-storming meeting in Cape Town without adequate preparation. At least, Natwar Singhji is aware that we organised brain-storming sessions even here, and in one of them, he also participated. I had the benefit of his advice, and I took the point that NAM, in order to continue to be relevant, has to have a relevant agenda. I agree with the point which has been made by Mr. Zahidi and others, that this agenda in the 21st century will be a largely economic agenda. Politics of the day will have an important role to play, like Iraq is a political issue. But as Members have said in this House, the Non-Aligned Movement will have to move to a more economic agenda because it is, utlimatley, the interests of the developing countries, which will have to be protected by the Non-Aligned Movement in political as well as economic issues. And, today, economic issues have started to assume for greater importance in the dea'ings of nations and groups of nations than was the case in the past. We are facing challenges in the World Trade Organisation. We are facing challenges elsewhere. We live in an unequal world. We live in a world, in a society, where the strong tries to suppress the weak, and, therefore, Sir, the weak have to remain united in order to be able to speak from a voice of or a position of strength. So, Non-Alignment is a movement to which India remains fully committed, and we played our role in the Non-Aligned Summit in Kuala Lumpur recently. It was a role which was played in view of the fact that India was a founder member of the NAM, in view of the fact that we have always been a very important member of the NAM, and it is a position which has been widely recognised in the Non-Aligned Movement. So, India will continue to play that role, despite the problems which the NAM is facing because of the fact that it is not merely confined to 25 members now. There are 116 members of the Non-Aligned Movement today. There are 116 members of the Non-Aligned Movement today and that creates its own, sometimes momentum and sometimes problems. Sir, as far as the leadership of the NAM is concerned, I am not sure whether—because I was not present in the House but I know that in the other House—the Prime Minister had laid on the Table of the House the Resolution, which was adopted, and the documents which were adopted. ...(*Interruptions*)... So, the Members are aware of the Resolution which was adopted by the Non-Aligned Movement on Iraq. But, I would like to take the House,

through you, into confidence and say that in the Ministerial Meeting, I did make this point. When some of the members were being strident, I said to them, in order to caution them, that there is no point in our being so strident here and talk of US aggression against Iraq, and then go back and make our territory available for US troops to commit that aggression. There should be some convergence between words and deeds.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I have said so today in my article in **Hindustan Times.** This very point I made. They are talking someting in public and else in private.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Thank you. Therefore, I was looking at the Resolution which was adopted at the Organisation of Islamic Conference as recently as the 5th of March. That is also I find a Resolution in which they bring in the Islamic element with which, as a secular country, we may or may not be in agreement. But the point is that Iraq has to be saved for us because Iraq is Iraq and people of India have sympathy with the people of Iraq, not necessarily because Iraq is an Islamic state. That is how we look at it. But OIC will look at it differently. But even there, I find that they have tempered their Resolution and they are talking of a peaceful solution. Now, Sir, I would like to mention just one thing and I will be done. It is not that international public opinion and the opinion of the nations of the world is not having its impact. After all, Mr. Collin Powell, Secretary of State, United States of America, decided to come to the Security Council to give all the evidence that he thought he had against Iraq and its being in further material breach. He did not address a press conference, he came to the Security Council. Similarly, in the statement, which I was referring to earlier today, of Mr. Bush—I don't have an authentic copy, the CNN.com world has this copy—who said that they are still in the final stages of diplomacy and then he goes on to say that he had not yet decided whether to invade Iraq. The UN Security Council members would decide in a matter of days whether they would join the United States in forcibly disarming Iraq. "We are calling for the vote", Mr. Bush said, "It is time for the people to show their cards. Let the world know where they stand, when it comes to Saddam." Now, if you forget about the language what is it that the President of the United States of America says. He is saying, "We are calling for a vote in the UN Security Council". It means that so far they have not given upon the

Security Council, they have not given up on the United Nations, they are still following this route. I have no doubt in may mind that this is the result of the pressure which has been brought by groups of countries, by India, on the United States. When President Bush spoke to Prime Minister Vajpayee the other day, this was again an occasion for the Prime Minister to repeat the advice which we have given to our American friends. But, we are giving this advice in a spirit of friendship, just as we are giving this advice in a spirit of friendship to Iraq. When the special envoy of the Iraqi President came, we told him "you must strengthen your friends. If you do not strengthen our hands, how do we help you. And, that strength will come if you fully comply". Let us see what report the Inspectors put in today, Hans Blix and his party. Today is a crucial day because the third report of the Inspectors is going to be presented to the UN Security Council. There are two Draft Resolutions which are doing the rounds in New York. As the Members are aware, there are two Draft Resolutions which are doing the rounds in New York, the Russian-French Resolution and the Anglo-American Resolution. As Natwar Singhji has pointed out, there is a slight change in the British position. It is quite likely that in the next few days, when the Security Council debates this issue, the pressure of international opinion on all the Members of the United Nations' Security Council could, perhaps, steer the Security Council affairs of Iraq in a direction, which will enable all of us to see that war is avoided. I will not give up optimism that the wisdom of the internaitonal community will work towards avoidance of a military conflict. I still remain hopeful. But I will agree with the sentiments which have been voiced in this House that while we continue to hope for the best, let us prepare for the worst. I would like to tell you that we have taken all these things into account and, as far as our interests are concerned, let me assure the House, through you, Sir, that India is ready and will continue to be in readiness to protect its national interest, its citizens and its strategic interest. We will not sacrifice on them. Thank you.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Sir, I am very grateful to the distinguished External Affairs Minister. I just want to put two questions: (a) I had asked about the views of the Government on the American doctrine of regime change. What are the ramifications of it, if they were to come around and say, "You please sit down and sort out the Kashmir issue with Pakistan under our auspices"? You can't rule this

out. It may be hypothetical; but it could happen. (b) I, being somebody slightly older than you, request you not to judge foreign affairs in terms of optimism or pessimism. They have to be judged in terms of realism. Optimism and pessimism are matters of temperament.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, I should have, perhaps, covered that point when I was replying to the discussion. India's position on Jammu and Kashmir is very clearly defined and, at least, after the 1972 Shimla Agreement, there has been no occasion and there has been no force in the world which has deflected us from that position. I would like to say, with all the emphasis at my command, that whatever may be the pressure and whoever might want to bring that pressure, India is not going to deviate form India's stated position on Jammu and Kashmir.

As far as regime change is concerned, it is something which India does not support. We have said it very clearly. The objective of Security Council Resolution No. 1441 is disarming Iraq of the weapons of mass destruction. It is not regime change. We agree entirely that it is not the responsibility of any power, super or otherwise, to go on changing regimes in other countries. That is our position. That is consistent with the principles of Panchsheel; that is consistent with the Charter of the United Nations; and we remain committed to those principles and the Charter. That is the issue. We are not going to submit to any pressure, as far as Jammu and Kashmir is concerned. India stands in a different category of Naitons. We are not so easy to push around. We have our own strength and we have the strength of national unity behind the issue of Jammu and Kashmir. Therefore, I have no doubt in my mind that if such a situation were to arise, the whole country would stand united like one person and resist such attempts. With these words, I should have requested Mr. Jibon Roy to withdraw the Resolution, because, since we have a consensus, there is, perhaps, no need for a Resolution in the language in which it has been drafted. I request him very humbly that he should not press for putting it to vote.

SHRI JIBON ROY: Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I am elated that a fruitful discussion, an enlightened discussion, has taken place on my Resolution and all have got an opportunity to vent their feelings. Probably, our commitment to the Foreign Policy is regalvanised and a message will go out that our country is against any threat of war and

we do not accept any unilateral action by anybody, whoever it might be, or its hegemony. I am very much glad that the hon. Members like Shri Natwar Singh and our External Affairs Minister were present and intervened in the discussion. It is not a question of pushing or pressing a Resolution, the main thing is our commitment of unanimity over the matter and the leadership of the Government to lead the entire people to face this crisis which is coming. As Shri Natwar Singh has pointed out, I also feel that if the war breaks out, it will be unlike the war in 1991. The war finished in a short time because of the slogal, 'change of regime'. I understand that the name of the operation, which the United States of America has given to, is 'The Head Transplantation'. That itself, may be, for technical reasons—will compel the US or whichever invader it might be to bring down Baghdad.

Army has to come to Baghdad. It is not Afghanistan. Afghanistan's terrain is the rural terrain and is not that much populated. Here, because of that, in 1991, the aerial bombing had taken place and they fled away. This time if they continue with this slogan, there will be an intensive bombing. That is number one. Secondly, the force, the invaders have to come straight to Baghdad and fighting will be in the streets. And, obviously, it will be a long drawn fight. It will not end in one week, two weeks or three weeks. The delegation, who were in Baghdad—you may talk with Basudevacharya and others—had also got the same feeling. That is why, these threat of wards should be taken in a correct perspective. Today, there was a news on T.V. that the Government is calling an all-party meeting on Monday and I believe the Government is also trying to evolve a consensus on how to deal with it. I also believe that with all the parties, the Government should be able to carry the entire nation on reaching a consensus.

With these words, I withdraw the Resolution.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Does the hon. Members have the permission of the House to withdraw his Resolution?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): The House is adjourned till 11.00 a.m. on Monday, the 10th March, 2003.

The House then adjourned at eighteen minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 10th March, 2003.

MGIPMRND—784RS—23.1.2004